HISPANIC CATHOLICISM IN TRANSITIONAL CALIFORNIA: THE LIFE OF JOSÉ GONZÁLEZ RUBIO, O.F.M. (1804-1875)

A dissertation by

Michael C. Neri

presented to

The Faculty of the
Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Berkeley, California
March 19, 1974

Committee Signatures:

Francis F. Guest, O.F.M.
Chairman

Eldon C. Ernst

Harland E. Hogue

Maynard F. Geiger, O.F.M.

XUM

PREFACE

The career of Father José González Rubio, as Franciscan missionary, diocesan administrator, pastor and religious educator, forms a major part of the last phase of Hispanic Franciscan activity in California. In recent years, the work of the early Franciscan founders and builders in California has been exhaustively and expertly explored. The primary purpose of this study is to examine the life and work of José González Rubio in order to provide a more complete picture of the later stages of the Hispanic Franciscan presence in California.

The work of José González Rubio in California, from his arrival in 1833 to his death in 1875, spanned the years of the decline of Mexican sovereignty, the Mexican War, the American conquest and the ascendancy of American social and cultural dominance in the state. His career, therefore, serves as a valuable focal point from which to study the double transition which California experienced in these years. First, there occurred the evolution from Spanish to Mexican social and political ideals, with the accompanying demise of the mission system. Then came the American conquest which saw the territory evolve from a Mexican frontier province into an American state.

Against the background of this double cultural and political evolution, the activity of González Rubio is a unique channel through which to study the experience of the Catholic Church in California as it changed from an Hispanic missionary organization to an integral part of the diocesan structure of the Catholic Church in the United States. This included the Church's attempts to deal with the ideological and religious pluralism of the new American

XUM

regime and the problem of a quickly expanding population which, for the most part, represented new religious and ethnic backgrounds.

In addition, the friar's work serves as a vehicle with which to understand the experience of the Spanish-speaking inhabitants of California as they struggled to cope with the new cultural, economic, political and social patterns which were part and parcel of the American system. The experience of González Rubio was intimately entwined with the experience of the Hispanic-Americans in early American California. His story, therefore, forms an indispensable part of the history of the Spanish-speaking community in the state.

Finally, the life of González Rubio illustrates the larger theme of the place of religion in periods of social, political, and cultural stress. While chronicling the work of one of the few Mexican Californians who continued to exercise positions of religious and social influence throughout the tumultuous years of transitional California, it witnesses to the profound association of religion, culture, and ethnic identity.

I wish to offer my gratitude to the Reverend Francis Guest, O.F.M., who first proposed this project to me and who supervised the preparation of this manuscript with constant encouragement and suggestions. This study could not have been written without the aid and guidance of the Reverend Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., whose meticulous organization of the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, personal interest and generosity with both time and information were indispensable to my research. I wish also to thank Professors Harland E. Hogue and Eldon G. Ernst for their valuable assistance in contextual questions regarding American religious history and the religious history of early American California. Finally, for the aid I received from Dr. Juan Martinez of the University of California, Berkeley, concerning Mexican-American history, I also extend my gratitude.

XUM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE..... iii

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS..... vi

Chapter

I. PROLOGUE IN MEXICO (1804-1832)..... 1

II. THE ROAD TO CALIFORNIA (1824-1833)..... 17

III. MISSION SAN JOSE (1833-1842)..... 37

IV. THE BISHOP'S SECRETARY (1842-1846)..... 66

V. ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MITRE (1846-1850)..... 79

VI. CATHOLIC AUTHORITY IN AMERICAN CALIFORNIA (1850-1856)..... 102

VII. THE GENESIS OF DISSENSION (1852-1858)..... 130

VIII. THE CONTROVERSY IN ROME (1859-1861)..... 166

IX. THE APOSTOLIC COLLEGE (1861-1873)..... 188

X. THE LAST YEARS (1862-1875)..... 208

EPILOGUE..... 225

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 230

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

AALA	Archives of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.
AASF	Archives of the Archdiocese of San Francisco.
BL	The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California.
FCR	Franciscan Curia Archives, Rome.
PAR	Archives of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, Rome.
SBMA	Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

CHAPTER I

PROLOGUE IN MEXICO (1804-1832)

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Guadalajara, Mexico, was the principal city of the province of Nueva Galicia in New Spain, which at that time was still a part of the vast Spanish-American Empire. It was in Guadalajara that José González Rubio was born between one and two o'clock in the morning on June 6, 1804. His parents were José María González Rubio, son of Antonio González Rubio and Francisca Gómez, and Manuela Gutiérrez, daughter of Manuel Gutiérrez and Petra Valdivia. Both of his parents were natives of Spain. This rendered young José a member of the Creole class which was composed of persons born of Spanish parents in the Spanish-American colonies. No exact information concerning other children in González Rubio's family was available to this author, but it can be surmised from subsequent Franciscan records that there were at least two other children.[1] These same records also give witness to the fact that his parents were known to be upright citizens and practicing Catholics.[2] On June 10, six days after his birth, the infant was brought to the cathedral in Guadalajara to be baptized. The Reverend Pedro de Ocampo officiated at the ceremony and conferred the name José Norberto Francisco on the child. Pablo Amador and Josefa Leiba stood as his godparents.[3]

A part of the legacy which José González Rubio received from his parents was the opportunity to obtain a good elementary and advanced education. After completing his primary education in the public schools, he attended the seminario conciliar of Guadalajara.[4] This

institution was a secondary school in humanities, science, and mathematics, which trained young men who wished to go on to higher studies in the university or other specialized technical and professional schools. It had a reputation for excellence in nineteenth-century Mexico and has been cited as the alma mater of many lawyers, jurists, scientists, literary figures, churchmen, and scholars who played prominent roles in Mexican affairs.[5] González Rubio then matriculated at the University of Guadalajara from which he emerged with a baccalaureate in philosophy at the age of sixteen years. The diploma is dated July 20, 1820.[6] It has been asserted that González Rubio next turned to the study of law.[7] Although there is no documentary evidence of this fact, it is not inconceivable since there is no other record of his activities between the years 1820 and 1824 and his later missionary career gave evidence that he had a commendable knowledge of canon law, as well as the principles and procedures of civil law. It was in 1824 that González Rubio applied to the Missionary College of Our Lady of Zapopan seeking admission to the Franciscan Order.[8]

The years between 1804 and 1824, in which José González Rubio was born and came to maturity, constituted a time of tremendous ferment in the history of Mexico. This epoch witnessed the twilight of Mexico's existence as a part of the Spanish Empire, the social, ideological, political, and military struggles of the revolution itself, and the emergence of an independent, if somewhat unsettled, Mexican nation. The movement for Mexican independence from Spain steadily gained momentum after the death of King Charles III in 1788. It was aggravated by the inept rule of Charles IV when power actually rested with Manuel Godoy, the queen's favorite. The final impetus came from the Napoleonic incursion into Spain and the seizure of Charles IV and Crown Prince Ferdinand.[9] The movement was nurtured primarily by the Creole class who resented the economic

XUM

and political privileges of the peninsular Spaniards in Mexico.

One of the groups contemplating definitive action to acquire independence went under the name of The Literary and Social Club of Querétaro. Among the members of this group were a commander of the local militia, Captain Ignacio Allende, and a parish priest from the small town of Dolores, Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. In the late summer of 1810, it was decided that Allende would declare for independence at the fair of San Juan de los Lagos, on December 18, 1810, at which time the populace would join him in rising up against Spanish rule. Word of the plot leaked out and the royal authorities began to put pressure on the conspirators, but they did not act swiftly enough. Hidalgo had enough time to gather his wits and a few Indian followers and, on September 16, 1810, he raised the famous Grito de Dolores. "Long live Our Lady of Guadalupe! Long live independence!" The first salvo in the Mexican War of Independence had been fired.

The revolutionary army of Hidalgo and Allende quickly swelled to 50,000 men. Within two weeks, it had swept through San Miguel el Grande (which was later renamed San Miguel de Allende) and Celayo. On September 28, the city of Guanajuato fell. Here there occurred at the hands of the rebels one of the bloodiest massacres in Mexican history. Mexico City would have been next, but a squabble between Allende and Hidalgo caused enough delay to foil the plan.[10]

Hidalgo, Allende, and their band of insurgents retired to Guadalajara and in this way briefly rendered the native city of José González Rubio as the focal point of the revolution. They entered the city on November 20, 1810, and Hidalgo himself was received amid ceremonial benedictions in the cathedral.[11] It was in Guadalajara that Hidalgo issued his famous proclamation freeing the slaves in Mexico, while Allende set about the business

of producing cannon and hand grenades, recruiting soldiers, and molding his men into a fighting unit. Allende accomplished a great deal during the three weeks that the insurgents were in Guadalajara, but it was all to prove in vain.

On December 12, 1810, when word came that General Félix Calleja was moving toward Guadalajara with a well-trained force of 6,000 men, Hidalgo led his army of 80,000 men, backed by ninety-five cannon, out to meet him. On January 17, 1811, the two armies clashed. Although Calleja was overwhelmingly outnumbered, his personal skill and expertly disciplined soldiers combined to completely rout the revolutionary army at the Puente de Calderón on the Lerma River.[12] It is reported that after this battle the citizens of Guadalajara who had sympathized with the insurrectionists were made to pay dearly by Calleja.[13] After this purge, no other major military action of the War of Independence occurred in Guadalajara. The city was allowed to spend the remaining years of the conflict in relative tranquility.[14]

The bloody excesses of Hidalgo's insurrectionists at the Alhóndiga massacre in Guanajuato caused the Creole revolutionaries to turn against this lower class rebellion and to ally themselves with the peninsular Spaniards. The behavior of Hidalgo's forces in Guadalajara intensified the Creole opposition to his cause and occasioned a lament which was published anonymously, apparently by a religious, and signed "El Criollo D.I.M.J.C.R.I.G." In the name of the Creole class, and obliquely in the name of the Church, it passionately denounced the vandalism, blasphemy, profanation, rapine, and murder of Hidalgo's rebels.[15] José González Rubio was a mere boy of six and a half years when all this took place. After 1811, the grim reality of the War of Independence was totally absent from Guadalajara. During the years in which young José was in elementary school, the seminario conciliar, and the university,

Guadalajara was a peaceful and flourishing city which was fast acquiring the reputation of being the second most important city in Mexico.[16]

Even the successful consummation of the revolution in 1821 failed to disturb the city's tranquility. On June 13, 1821, the reality of independence was celebrated with extraordinary pomp in the cathedral of Guadalajara. General José de la Cruz, the defeated royalist administrator, slipped quietly out of the city by way of Zapopan, proceeded through Zacatecas to Durango, signed the articles of surrender, and returned to Spain.[17] In 1824, Guadalajara, which had always been the principal city of the province of Nueva Galicia, became the capital of the new state of Jalisco under the auspices of the government of the infant Mexican nation.[18]

Another aspect of the Guadalajaran experience in the first decades of the nineteenth century was the accelerated rate of civic improvement. This was part of the process which elevated the city to a level of cultural importance and civic pride second only to Mexico City. In 1803, Juan Cruz Ruis de Cabañas, the Bishop of Guadalajara, inaugurated the building of a hospicio de pobres, or social service center, for the poor of the city. Building on this project continued unabated for seven years until 1810 when it was interrupted by the outbreak of the revolution. Construction resumed when peace returned to the city. This hospice provided food, shelter, clothing, and medical care for the poor, widows, and orphans. It had a nursery for orphaned infants and a primary school for older children.[19] In 1806, an earthquake hit Guadalajara, causing much minor damage and totally destroying the parish church at Zapotlán which was fully occupied at the time the quake occurred. About 1,000 persons were killed in the tragedy. The damage caused by the quake gave impetus to new construction and other physical improvements. Twelve years later, in 1818, another jarring earthquake

occurred which toppled the towers of the cathedral. This quake also occasioned repair work and additional civic improvements.[20]

On August 19, 1809, the Junta de Policía promulgated a plan to divide the city of Guadalajara into twenty-four areas and to issue definite street names to a number of thoroughfares. This type of activity continued into the revolutionary years. On April 25, 1814, the cabildo, or metropolitan council, passed more legislation dealing with the division and organization of the city. In addition to the process of issuing more definite street names, it provided for the numbering of residences and commercial buildings and the demarcation and naming of certain public squares.[21]

The primary and most consistent impetus to the physical beautification and civic reform of Guadalajara during the years between 1814 and 1821 came from General José de la Cruz, the last representative of the Spanish Crown to govern the city. Under his direction the facades of many private residences and public buildings were cleaned and painted. New streets were built and paved, while older ones received long overdue repairs and maintenance. A new bridge, the Puente de las Damas, was constructed, as well as numerous fountains to adorn the public squares. De la Cruz also ordered improvements and repairs on the city's aqueduct to insure an abundance of water for the populace. He also restructured the police force to insure public safety and carried on a successful campaign to eradicate political graft and administrative corruption in the city.[22]

Physical beautification, political ferment, and civic pride created a vital tempo in Guadalajara during González Rubio's student years. Amid the swirl of these events, young José came to an awareness that he had a vocation to the religious life, the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the Franciscan missionary apostolate.

XUM

The appropriate educational and religious institution to which José González Rubio would apply to pursue his vocation was the missionary college. These institutions had their origin in the drive to revitalize Hispanic missionary endeavor in Spanish America at the end of the seventeenth century. The first of them was founded under the motivation of Father Antonio Línaz de Jesús María, a Majorcán Spanish Franciscan of the Province of Michoacán in New Spain. He presented his ideas to José Ximeninez de Samaniego, the Franciscan Minister General, who recommended them to the Council of the Indies in the hope of influencing King Charles II of Spain to be favorably disposed to the project.[23] On April 18, 1682, the king issued a royal cédula authorizing the foundation of the missionary college. The following month, on May 8, 1682, Pope Innocent XI issued the bull Sacrosancti Apostolatus Officium establishing the institution, in which he defined the two purposes of such a college as the education of new missionaries and the physical, mental, and spiritual renewal of veteran missionaries.[24]

Between 1682 and 1816 twenty-five missionary colleges are known to have been founded in the Spanish-American colonies. The seven which were located in New Spain, along with their respective years of establishment, were: Colegio de Santa Cruz de Querétaro (1682), Colegio de Cristo Crucificado de Guatamala (1692), Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas (1704), Colegio de San Fernando de la Ciudad de Mexico (1734), Colegio de San Francisco de Pachuca (1771), Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Orizaba (1790), Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Zapopan (1816).[25] They were administered directly by the Roman Congregation of Propaganda Fide, through the auspices of the commissariat of the American missions.[26] Originally the colleges were to limit their membership to thirty, but this provision was deleted and they were allowed to

admit their own novices. The immediate administrator of the college was the guardian, who was appointed by the Franciscan Minister General from a list of candidates submitted by the priests in residence. The guardian had a vicar who often doubled as the master of novices, and a council of four friars to act as consultants. This group was known as the discretory, and each of the four members were called discreets. Each college had the prerogative of formulating its own statutes, according to its unique goals and objectives, always with the provision that local regulations met the approval of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide in Rome.[27]

The religious and intellectual discipline in the missionary colleges was rigorous. Members were expected to keep a schedule which included daily mental prayer, Mass, and recitation of the divine office in community, as well as personal prayer and devotions. There were assigned hours for meals and recreation, lectures, private study, and rest. The educational aspect of the missionary colleges sought to train aspirants to convert, catechize, and missionize the Indian population of Spanish America. It was concerned with Indian languages and customs, and the application of dogmatic and moral theology to the unique sociological and cultural experience of the Indians. Finally, the missionary colleges provided a center for community, moral support, and brotherhood among the friars who had chosen to share the Franciscan missionary vocation. It was a forum where beginning and veteran missionaries could share experiences, wisdom, insights, and questions about the practical execution of their assignments.[28]

The missionary college which José González Rubio chose to attend was located near Guadalajara in the neighboring village of Zapopan. Antonio de Segovia, a Franciscan friar who participated in the founding of Zapopan in the sixteenth century, brought with him a statue of the

XUM

Virgin Mary which he enshrined in the parish church of the village, and to which he assigned December 18 as a day of veneration. Devotion to the Virgin of Zapopan grew rapidly among the inhabitants of the village, and soon the image was deemed to possess miraculous powers. In 1642, Juan Ruis Colmenero, the Bishop of Guadalajara, ordered a legal investigation of the miracles of the Virgin of Zapopan. This caused the devotion of the faithful to increase, and they determined to build a bigger, more sumptuous church in the Virgin's honor. After many delays, the new church was dedicated by the Bishop of Guadalajara, Nicholás Gómez de Cervantes, in September, 1729. In 1734, the Virgin of Zapopan was named Protectress of Guadalajara against storms. So began the custom of removing the statue from the church at Zapopan and carrying it in procession to the cathedral and other churches of Guadalajara on June 13, and returning it to the original church on October 5 of each year. These processions became the most popular civic and religious event in Guadalajara. The number of participants often exceeded 15,000 persons. It so happened that the day upon which the independence of Mexico was proclaimed, June 13, 1821, coincided with the annual spring procession of the Virgin of Zapopan. Consequently, she was regaled with another title, Generala de las armas de Jalisco, and charged with the patronage of the Mexican army in the state.[29]

When José González Rubio received the Franciscan habit at the College of Our Lady of Zapopan early in 1824, the institution was barely emerging from the formative years of its infancy. Since 1803, Juan Cruz Ruis de Cabañas, the Bishop of Guadalajara, had intended to found a missionary college at Zapopan. He had received a gift of $120,000.00 for the foundation of the college from Sor Manuela de la Presentación Barrena y Vizcarra, on the

occasion of her solemn profession as a nun. Because of the confusion and political turmoil in Spain during those years, the process of getting permission for the foundation was complicated and delayed. After the cédula granting the permission was released by the Council of the Indies, it took two years to arrive in Guadalajara. Finally, on January 18, 1814, the president of the audiencia gave his compliance and the project was allowed to proceed.[30] The permission of the commissary general of the Franciscan Order was sought and received, and the guardian and discretory of the Missionary College of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Zacatecas was petitioned to send friars to found the new college. The College of Guadalupe acceded to this request and sent Fray Francisco Barrón as the founder and first president. He was accompanied by Francisco García Diego and Mariano Velasco y Figueroa, both priests, and Antonio Assa, a Franciscan lay brother.[31]

Upon their arrival in Guadalajara, the Zacatecan founders of the College of Our Lady of Zapopan were given residence in the house of the bishop. They celebrated their first Mass as a new community on July 4, 1815. Although the founding of the college is dated from 1816, the founding friars did not occupy it until 1819 when Father President Barrón insisted that they move into habitable portions of the buildings, even though construction was not yet completed. During these years there was some thought of recruiting friars from Spain for the new college, but both the bishop and Juan Manuel Cabillero, the syndic, realized the impossibility of this in light of the revolution then in progress.[32] From November 11 to November 15, 1819, the bishop, the Franciscan community, and the people of Zapopan celebrated and solemnized the foundation of the college with festivals, processions, and a pontifical Mass. In October, 1822, the Franciscans moved into permanent living quarters. Within two years,

XUM

members of the new college were engaged in preaching their first missions in Tierra Caliente, Colima, Tepic, Etzatlán, Tula, Ejutla, Pelones, San Clemente, Mascota, Hostotipaquillo, Ahuacatlán, Ixtlán, Jala, La Yesca, La Magdalena, Ayutla, Talpa, Tomatlan, Ameca, Santa Maria del Oro, Autlán, Tapalpa, San Gabriel, and Zapotlán el Grande. These preaching missions were of short duration and were aimed at rekindling the religious fervor of the faithful. They did not entail the founding of permanent missionary establishments.[33]

It was to this young College of Our Lady of Zapopan that José González Rubio petitoned for admission into the Franciscan Order. On January 9, 1824, he was invested with the habit and received as a novice.[34] In the fall of 1824, toward the end of González Rubio's novitiate year, Fray Luis de Vergara, the guardian of the college, commissioned a formal and thorough investigation into the novice's past life and qualifications for a religious vocation, in light of his impending candidacy for vows. On October 12, 1824, Fray Francisco Márquez was appointed comisario de la información and placed in charge of the investigation. Four days later Márquez accepted the post and appointed Antonio Gutiérrez, a cleric, as notary. On October 18, 1824, Gutiérrez stated that the preliminary questioning of five witnesses for secret information turned up no impediment for admission to vows.[35]

The investigation then proceeded to a questioning of the five witnesses on matters of public information. This took place from October 19 to October 22, 1824. The first witness was Father Agustín Santos, the pastor of the church of San José de Analco. Santos certified that he had known González Rubio's father to be a just and honest man. His mother had died, but Santos testified to her well-deserved good reputation. Young José had had no trouble with the law. His birth was legitimate and he

XUM

possessed a fine education. His behavior was moral, forthright, and capable of withstanding scrutiny, with no hidden faults which might be uncovered to create scandal. The young novice had no debts or financial obligations. He was not bound by a consummated marriage, nor did he have the obligation of supporting his father in old age since he had brothers to do so. He was healthy, and had never been admitted to any other religious order.

The next witness was Father Francisco Aguilar, the curate of San José de Analco. His testimony was substantially the same. The testimonies of Father Narciso Becerra and Narciso Antonio Nuño followed suit. The final witness, Quirino González, agreed. He described José González Rubio as prudent, thoughtful, honest, and inclined to virtue and to study. On October 22, 1824, Fray Francisco Márquez, the comisario de la información, declared the investigation closed, and proclaimed José González Rubio a fitting candidate for full acceptance into the Franciscan Order.[36]

Accordingly, on January 10, 1825, one year and one day after entering the Franciscans as a novice, González Rubio took his solemn vows in the presence of Father Francisco Barrón, the founder and president of the Missionary College of Our Lady of Zapopan. He took the name José María de Jesús. Later in the same year the young friar received minor orders, the subdiaconate, and the diaconate at Durango. After nearly three more years of theological studies, he was ordained priest in the chapel of the episcopal palace of Puebla by the Most Reverend Antonia Joaquín Pérez, on December 22, 1827. Faculties to preach and to hear confessions were granted to Fray José María de Jesús González Rubio two years later, on December 10, 1829.[37]

No detailed record of the activity of González Rubio during his years as a cleric and priest at the College of Our Lady of Zapopan were available to this author. It can be safely assumed, however, that he traveled, as

XUM

witnessed by his presence in Durango and Puebla, followed the regimen of theological studies and missionary preparation which were discussed above, and engaged himself in the local apostolic commitments which his college had already undertaken. But also during these years González Rubio came to a knowledge of the mission field to which he wished to commit his life and labors. He next appeared making arrangements to go to the Franciscan missions in Alta California.

XUM

NOTES

CHAPTER I

[1]Información Juridica de la Limpieza de Sangre, Vida, y Costumbres, Zapopan, October 22, 1824, SBMA.

[2]Theodore Arentz, Sketch of the Life of Very Rev. P. José María de Jesús González Rubio, MS, p. 1, SBMA.

[3]Información Juridica, cf. note 1.

[4]Arentz, op. cit., p. 2.

[5]Cf. Augustín Rivera y Sanramon, Los Hijos de Jalisco (2d ed.; Guadalajara: Escuela de Artes i Oficios, 1897), for a brief treatment of the history, purpose, and organization of the seminario conciliar of Guadalajara, as well as a list of prominent faculty and alumni between the years 1792 and 1867. José González Rubio is not mentioned. Rivera refers to the school as the trunk of the literary tree of Jalisco in the nineteenth century.

[6]Arentz, loc. cit.. Maynard Geiger, "The Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Santa Barbara, California (1853-1885)," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 29.

[7]Ibid.

[8]For brief summaries of Gonzalez Rubio's early years cf. Maynard Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries in Hispanic California 1769-1848: A Biographical Dictionary (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1969), p. 113. Zephyrin Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1923), p. 385.

[9]Cf. C.H. Haring, The Spanish Empire in America (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1947), pp. 314-325, for a brief treatment of the economic and political aspects of the movement for independence in the Spanish-American colonies.

[10]Cf. Lesley Bird Simpson, Many Mexicos (3d ed. rev.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp. 183-201, for a good summary of these events, as well as the remainder of the War of Independence. For a fine study of Hidalgo's activity in relation to the War of Independence in Mexico cf. Hugh M. Hamill, The Hidalgo Revolt (Gainesville, University of Florida Press, 1966).

XUM

[11]José Cornejo Franco, Guadalajara Colonial (Guadalajara: Edición de la Camara Nacional de Comercio y Industria de Guadalajara, 1938), p. 48. Joaquín Romo de Vivar y Torres, Guadalajara (Guadalajara: Ediciones del Banco Industrial de Jalisco, S.A., 1964), p. 19.

[12]Romo de Vivar y Torres, op. cit., p. 20. Simpson, op. cit., p. 191.

[13]Romo de Vivar y Torres, loc. cit.

[14]Cornejo Franco, loc. cit.

[15]El Criollo D.I.M.J.C.R.I.G., Relación Cristiana de los Males que ha sufrido Guadalajara por los Insurgentes (Guadalajara: February 11, 1811).

[16]Romo de Vivar y Torres, loc. cit.

[17]Ibid., p. 22.

[18]Ibid., p. 25.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[21]Luis Páez Brotchie, Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico (Guadalajara: 1951), pp. 133-135.

[22]Cornejo Franco, loc. cit. Romo de Vivar y Torres, op. cit., p. 20.

[23]José Asencio, Origen de los Colegios Apostólicos, (Guadalajara: Banco Industrial de Jalisco, S.A., 1947), p. 10. cf. Felix Saiz Diez, Los Colegios de Propaganda Fide en Hispanoamérica (Madrid: Raycar, S.A., 1969).

[24]Pius Joseph Barth, Franciscan Education and the Social Order in Spanish North America (1502-1821) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 318.

[25]Ibid., p. 316.

[26]Francis Borgia Steck, Ensayos, Historicos Hispano-Americanos (Mexico: 1940), p. 62.

[27]Cf. Ibid., pp. 57-73.

[28]Cf. Barth, op. cit., pp. 321-328. Marion Habig, Franciscan Apostolic Colleges in Hispanic America, MS, SBMA.

XUM

[29]Romo de Vivar y Torres, op. cit., pp. 22-23. cf. Luis Palacio y Basave, Recopilación de noticias y datos que se relacionan con la milagrosa imagen de Nuestra Señora de Zapopan y con su colegio y santuario (Guadalajara: Talleres de Universidad de Guadalajara, 1942), for details concerning the history of the Virgin of Zapopan.

[30]Asencio, op. cit., p. 65.

[31]Ibid. Romo de Vivar y Torres, op. cit., p. 23.

[32]Asencio, op. cit., p. 66. A syndic is a layman officially appointed to manage the financial affairs of Franciscan establishments. This arrangement arose because of the friars' vow of poverty which prohibited them from handling money matters.

[33]Ibid., pp. 67-69. cf. Luis Palacio y Basave, Historia Breve y Compendiosa de Colegio Apostolico de Propaganda Fide de Nuestra Señora de Zapopan (Guadalajara: C.M. Sainz, 1925).

[34]Arentz, op. cit., p. 3. Engelhardt, loc. cit. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," ibid., XVI:2 (October, 1953), 30.

[35]Información Juridica, cf. note 1.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Arentz, op. cit., pp. 3-4. Geiger, loc. cit.

XUM

CHAPTER II

THE ROAD TO CALIFORNIA (1824-1833)

The mission fields of Alta California in which José María de Jesús González Rubio wished to invest his labor were caught in a flurry of chaos and confusion between 1824, three years after the achievement of Mexican independence, and 1833, the year of the friar's arrival in the territory. The first of these missions had been founded at San Diego in 1769 under the impetus of José de Gálvez, the Spanish inspector-general, who wished to extend Spanish influence up the coast of Alta California in order to stave off Russian and English expansion on the northern frontier of the Spanish-American Empire.[1] The Majorcan Franciscan, Father Junípero Serra, whose perseverance has become almost legendary, was the founder and first president of the missions of Alta California. He was directly involved in the establishment of nine missions before his death in August of 1784.[2] Between 1785 and 1803, Father President Fermín Francisco de Lasuén, Serra's successor, doubled their number to eighteen. It was under Lasuén's efficient administration that the missions developed into the system which has become familiar to the popular mind.[3] By 1823, the chain of twenty-one missions was numerically complete, but ironically the seeds of its decline had already been planted. The events which occurred in the California missions in the years between 1824 and 1833 provided the prologue to González Rubio's arrival. A brief perusal of these events should render a clear context for the new missionary's first assignment to Mission San José early in 1833.

The man whom González Rubio succeeded at Mission San José in 1833 was Father Narciso Durán, then Father

President of the missions of Alta California. Since 1824, when Durán had been named to the presidency, he had been deeply involved in the confused state of affairs which Mexican independence had occasioned in the missions. Because of his central role, Durán's activity serves as a useful focal point for a survey of California mission history in the decade prior to González Rubio's arrival. This is especially true in regard to the central theme of those years, the initial efforts of the civil authorities to wrest control of the mission holdings from the friars through repeated attempts at secularization. The basic political and social theories which gave impetus to the revolution in Mexico against Spanish rule and the liberal ideals of the Federal Constitution of the United Mexican States of 1824 assumed a social and economic order based on civil freedom, racial equality, and the separation of civil and military power.[4] Although two years were to pass before the first attempts to set the process of secularization in motion manifested themselves, the secularization of the missions of Alta California became an actuality as individual administrators sought to apply these ideological and social ideals to the California situation.

In the years between 1826 and 1830, José María de Echeandía, the Governor of California, and the Junto de Fomento, the Committee for Promoting the Progress of the Californias, made the first concrete attempts at experimenting with the emancipation of the Indians and the conversion of the missions into pueblos, or townships. On July 25, the Governor put forth a plan for the partial emancipation of certain Indians who might qualify.[5] But the plan was only partially realized. In 1828, Echeandía put forth another plan for the conversion of the missions into pueblos. It provided for the division of mission lands, tools, and livestock, and the founding of schools and seminaries. But it too was incapable of being realized because of the instability of the economy and the unpreparedness of the Indians

for freedom.[6] In addition, it is important to note that in 1828 no law regarding the colonization of the mission lands could be legally promulgated because the question of the Indians' right to the mission property and produce had not yet been decided.[7]

The main issue during these years, therefore, was not the actuality of any large-scale application of the policy of secularization, but the clarification of the ambiguous relationship between the authority of the civil government and that of the missionaries in regard to the Indians and the revenue of the missions. Ideologically, Echeandía wanted the implementation of secularization to be brought about as soon as possible, but, practically, the dependence of the civil government on the revenue of the missions made this extremely difficult, if not impossible. A policy of taxing the missions was substituted as a compromise measure.

In regard to the state of the Indians, the correspondence of Narciso Durán during these years reveals a twofold attitude. He both distrusted the motives behind the government's insistence on emancipation and harbored a real fear of the lack of discipline arising among the Indians who had been exposed to irresponsible notions of freedom. Durán's letter to Governor Echeandía, dated November 13, 1827, conveyed a lack of confidence in the government's purported concern for the welfare of the Indians and hinted that exploitation, rather than emancipation, might have been the true motive of the government's actions.[8] In this letter, Durán complained that former Governor Luis Argüello had cheated the Indians out of some small boats when the Governor alleged that they had been carrying on illegal commerce with foreign ships anchored in San Francisco Bay. The friar went on to ask why, if this allegation had been true, the Indians were the only ones to be prosecuted. He protested that the law should be applied

equally to all citizens and that the Indians were the ones who could least afford to be subject to its unequal application. If any doubt should remain as to his implication, Durán then went on to intimate that, perhaps, Argüello's intention in confiscating the boats might have been attributed to his own desire to possess them.

This opinion of Durán's that the government should cease from using the law to oppress the Indians was coupled with the insistence that, whether emancipation was in the air or not, the civil authorities still had the responsibility of keeping order among the neophytes by aiding the missionaries with military force if necessary. This concern was expressed in two letters to Comandante Ygnacio Martínez of the Presidio of San Francisco in November of 1828. In the letter of November 8, Durán informed Martínez that Indians were running away from his mission at San José because they no longer had any respect for the authority of the Mexican soldiers.[9] The following day, Durán addressed another letter to Martínez. This time, he became more explicit in asking the comandante for ten soldiers to help him control the Indians. He put pressure on Martínez by reporting that the Indians were mocking the Mexican military by saying that the soldiers were lazy and incapable of using their firearms correctly.[10]

The second theme of note between 1826 and 1830 concerned the financial relationship between the missions and the civil government. Durán's correspondence during these years is replete with fiscal reports and accounts for his mission at San José directed to the departmental government for purposes of taxation.[11] In a response to Commissary of War Herrera's request for an accounting of the income and property of Mission San José for tax purposes, Durán made his position very clear.[12] He refused to pay the diezmo, or ten per-cent tax, in this instance because he had been supplying provisions for the Presidio

of San Francisco, because of the goods and services of which individual soldiers had availed themselves, and because he had been faithful in paying his taxes for the first half of the year. Durán insisted that he was not against the tax, that he paid it "religiously," but that "order" and "justice" demanded that he should not pay more than was required. "I appeal to natural law for a justification of whether the mission should or should not pay the ten per-cent of its income when it has already paid it in advance and in surplus."[13]

In the fall of 1826, there are to be found two more pieces of correspondence from Durán to Herrera which throw more light on the former's attitude toward the question of taxation. In the first, dated September 10, Durán informed Herrera that he had forwarded the amount that was requested of him and asked that the accounts be adjusted accordingly.[14] Apparently, however, Herrera had petitioned Durán for even more income which he suggested be raised by selling some of the mission cattle. Durán sympathized with Herrera on the sad state of the economy, but refused this request for extra revenue on the grounds that the cattle were the rightful possession of the Indians and that he did not possess the right to confiscate it.

This refusal of Durán's could raise the question as to whether he was denying the government revenue which he had a legal obligation to pay. Durán's letter to Herrera in the following month dispels this notion. In his response to further requests for revenue from the sale of mission cattle on October 13, Durán advised Herrera to avoid <u>getting into debt</u> to the missions, and he offered some suggestions regarding the better fiscal management of the government troops.[15] This indicates that any additional income which the mission provided would be over and above that which was required.

Two letters in the following year, 1827, to

XUM

Echeandía and Herrera indicate Durán's willingness to co-operate with the taxation policy of the government, as well as his insistence that the government do its part in keeping its records and financial management efficient and orderly.[16] These letters betray the presence of mistrust and tension on the part of both Durán and the civil administrators, but, at the same time, they are statements of Durán's willingness to fulfill his legal obligations.

Durán's attitude during the years between 1826 and 1830 in regard to governmental policies regarding the Indians and the missions may be characterized as one of cautious co-operation. While he was dubious about the sincerity of the government in their regard for the freedom of the Indians, he admitted the necessity of utilizing civil and military authority to keep the Indians under control.

Regarding the government's right to a percentage of the income of the missions, Durán's position was also ambivalent. While he agreed to the legality of the claim, he was cautious of the possible abuses which could result. He had two reservations. He feared that the civil government would go into debt to the missions and, therefore, have a reason to heap more hatred on the mission system because of its dependency and jealousy of the mission's financial solvency. More importantly, Durán's co-operation with the government program of mission taxation ended whenever he felt that the property rights of the Indians were being threatened. By 1830, then, Durán's attitude toward governmental intervention in the mission system was one of acceptance. But it was a conditional acceptance, and the condition was the welfare of the Indians.

With the arrival of the year 1830, the impetus toward the actual secularization of the missions was greatly intensified. In that year, Governor Echeandía put forth his plan for the conversion of the missions

XUM

into pueblos.[17] And the push for secularization was greatly stepped up with the arrival of Jose María Padrés as the adjutant inspector from Mexico. The republicanism of Padres was much more ideologically radical than Echeandía's. And, although the accession of the more conservative Anastasio Bustamante to the presidency of Mexico was a threat to his secularization plans, Padrés set about stirring up as much pro-secularization feeling as possible in the hopes of accomplishing his scheme before the arrival of Bustamante's new appointee to the governorship, Manuel Victoria. The influence of Padrés, however, went beyond encouraging a faster timetable. It also essentially changed the nature of the secularization which was demanded.[18] Rather than asking that the missions be turned into towns, Padrés wanted all the mission lands to revert to the public domain. He asked also for the total emancipation of the Indians.

In the midst of the ideological tension and political unrest of 1830, Durán composed two letters to Bustamante, the new President of Mexico, in response to the latter's request for information concerning the state of affairs in California. The first is dated May 10, 1830.[19] The content of this letter constituted a complaint concerning the treatment which the missionaries were receiving in the midst of the political upheavals even though they were struggling to stay free of factional involvement. Durán felt that the key to the problem was the fact that the missions were being saddled with ever greater demands to provide supplies for the government troops which cast the missionaries in the role of economic oppressors of the Indians instead of their spiritual fathers. He protested that he was willing to undergo hardship as a part of his vocation, but that it was more difficult to suffer the results of immorality and greed. He closed by asking for the president's protection of the missionaries in their

XUM

distress.

In the fall of 1830, Durán addressed a second letter to Bustamante in which he gave more specific suggestions for the amelioration of the situation in California.[20] In response to Bustamante's offer of economic aid to the missions, Durán replied that the missions did not need an increase in income. They were capable of being self-supporting, and aid from the central government only aroused the further animosity of the civil authorities in California. He protested that the economic difficulties of the missions were a result of their being forced to support the military, and told Bustamante that the solution to the problem lay in the necessity of the federal government sending money for the support of the soldiers. If the troops received their pay, Durán opined, much of the tension between the missionaries and the civil government could be relieved.

In regard to the condition of the Indians, Durán admitted that the task of civilizing them was difficult. He restated the paternalistic view that they were, by nature, childlike and irresponsible, and that they would certainly return to paganism and savagery as a result of the haphazard attempts at emancipation which had been conceived. But, precisely at this point, when he appeared to be verging on total reactionism, Durán asserted his belief in the workability of gradual emancipation. He, then, went on to propose his own plan for the emancipation of the Indians and the secularization of the missions. Here is the plan in Durán's own words:

> It is very plain and simple. Let twenty young and exemplary missionaries come here, and let the troops of the four presidios receive their pay. Then let a new chain of missions and presidios be established to the east of the coast range mountains. Then let the neophytes choose between joining the new missions and receiving their share of the present mission property with all the rights of citizenship like the white people, and forming

> civilized towns or ranchos. Finally, let the surplus land be divided among settlers in order to encourage colonization.[21]

Nevertheless, on January 6, 1831, Governor Echeandía succumbed to the political pressures which his imminent replacement by the more conservative Victoria entailed by publishing his decree for the secularization of the missions.[22] In thirty-three articles he ruled for the virtual removal of the mission temporalities from the administration of the friars and placed this administration in the hands of civil authorities. Echeandía, in the preamble, claimed that the motivation for the decree was his concern that the secularization law of September 13, 1813 be carried out, and that the Indians be removed from their oppressive lot under the control of the friars.[23] Provisions were made for the founding of schools, townships, and ranches for the welfare of the Indians; but, in essence, the administration of these entities was left to devolve, not on the Indians, but on civil administrators in the existing pueblos, and others whom the government might appoint. The Indians were to be reimbursed for their mission holdings in parcels of land, tools, and livestock, according to their age and marital status. In light of the circumstances which led to this decree, it has been labelled "illegal" and "hasty."[24]

On December 31, 1831, Durán published his reply and rebuttal to Echeandía's decree.[25] This work has been called "one of the ablest documents ever written by a friar in California."[26] Durán's method was to attack each of Echeandía's articles in turn, attempting to demonstrate their incompatability with the spirit and letter of the secularization law of 1813, which the Governor had declared to be the basis of his argument. And, at the same time, the friar pointed out the inconsistencies in Echeandía's program in regard to the Indians whom the Governor purported

to be protecting.

Specifically, Durán addressed himself to the following central themes. Echeandía was wrong in laying the current oppression of the Indians at the feet of the missionaries. No such state of affairs existed before the demands of the army for provisions made the friars into taskmasters. Durán placed this turning point in 1825, the year of Echeandía's arrival as governor. According to Echeandía, the Indians were to be made political wards of civil administrators, and, ultimately, of the members of the existing town councils, or ayuntamientos. Durán responded that this would leave them open to political and economic exploitation, and was in direct violation of the law of 1813 which stated that the Indians, upon the secularization of the missions, were to be put in charge of their civil affairs through the medium of their own ayuntamientos. This could come about only if the missions were allowed to evolve into townships under the direction of the Indians themselves which Durán had proposed in his letter of September 23, 1830.[27]

Regarding Indian property, Durán protested that under Echeandía's decree, mission holdings, both real and movable, would pass to the control of civil administrators rather than to the Indians. This would not lead to an improvement of the Indians' material welfare or sense of dignity but would give the white administrators the opportunity to speculate, exploit, and enrich themselves at the expense of the Indians. Durán went on to say that the reimbursement which the Indians were to receive from the profits of secularization were far from adequate, and he asked, rather caustically, who would benefit from the remainder of the mission wealth.

Finally, Durán addressed the question of founding schools for the Indians. He cited specific objections based on the problem of teachers' salaries and the lack of

qualified teaching personnel in the territory; but, more importantly, he launched an attack on the cultural and intellectual level of the entire Hispanic population of California. He referred to them as "so-called people of reason."[28] The Hispanic population of the territory should not have been so presumptuous as to think that they could raise the intellectual and cultural level of the Indians when they were so deficient themselves. He closed by stating that such noble motives were but a sham and a pretext for the real reason behind Echeandía's illegal and ill-conceived plan, which was the exploitation of the goods and lands of the missions, and therefore of the Indians.

Echeandía made one last attempt at secularization before leaving California when he held power in the southern portion of the territory in 1832. On November 11 of that year, he issued a decree of secularization for the four southernmost missions, San Diego, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano, and San Gabriel.[29] In general, this decree was an attempt to apply the substance of the decree of January 6, 1831, to these four missions with a few minor changes. But Echeandía prefaced it with remarks concerning the oppression of the Indians at the hands of the friars, the success of the emancipation experiment at San Juan Capistrano, and his desire that the friars actively co-operate with the project.

In the following month, Durán addressed himself to this document in a circular letter to the missionaries.[30] The essence of this letter was the expression of Durán's anger at Echeandía's vilification of the missionaries for the sake of cloaking his plan in the guise of a defense of the Indians. He attacked both the logic and the legality of Echeandía's plan and reasserted his basic contention that schemes for instant emancipation would lead not to the welfare of the Indians, but to their exploitation. He protested that the paternalistic concern of the friars could

not be compared to the greed of the secular administrators. Durán concluded by counseling the friars against any active co-operation with the plan on the grounds that experience had proven that instantaneous emancipation only militated against the welfare of the Indians and the peace of the territory. This was the state of affairs in the missions of Alta California on the eve of 1833, the year of González Rubio's arrival at Mission San José.

After Mexican independence, antipathy and suspicion against Spain and Spaniards prevailed in all parts of Mexico. And Spain in turn refused even to acknowledge Mexican independence until 1836, a full fifteen years after the fact. This was countered in Mexico with a crusade to rid the country of persons of Spanish birth. In May of 1827, all persons of Spanish birth were forbidden to hold any office, civil or military, in Mexico. And, on December 20, 1827, all native-born Spaniards, with a certain few exceptions, were asked to leave the country.[31] In Alta California, this anti-Spanish feeling was directed at the Franciscan missionaries, all of whom prior to 1827 were Spaniards sent from the Missionary College of San Fernando in Mexico City. These twenty-eight friars increased the government's suspicion of their patriotism by refusing to take an unconditional oath of allegiance to the Mexican Constitution of 1824.[32] But Governor Echeandía realized that the wholesale expulsion of these friars was a practical impossibility because the survival of the territory depended on the missions, and the missions would collapse without the leadership of the Franciscans. In a letter to the Mexican Minister of Justice, dated August 11, 1829, the Governor protested that no such expulsion was viable unless other missionaries were sent from Mexico to take the place of the Spanish friars.[33] These events accelerated the demand for the recruitment of native Mexican Franciscans to labor in the missions of Alta California.

The missionary college which was selected by the Mexican government to provide the native Mexican missionaries for Alta California was the College of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Zacatecas.[34] Unfortunately, there is a paucity of primary sources concerning the arrangements and considerations which led to this choice.[35] But the fact that its membership was composed entirely of native Mexican Franciscans, and that Fray Francisco García Diego y Moreno, the commissary-prefect of its missions, was known for his loyalty to Mexico marked it as appropriate to undertake the task.[36] Although García Diego was a religious, he was closely in touch with the social and political aspirations of his native land. On November 11, 1821, he had delivered a lengthy sermon on the subject of the newly achieved independence of Mexico in which he portrayed the end of Spanish domination as the occasion for the birth of a new and vital Catholicism in Mexico.[37] García Diego numbered among his personal friends Anastasio Bustamante and Valentín Gómez Farías, both of whom he had known since his student days, and both of whom were destined to exercise the office of president of Mexico.[38] On July 21, 1828, the friar was appointed commissary-prefect of the missions of the College of Our Lady of Guadalupe.[39] Certainly his reputation as a patriot made him an excellent appointee to oversee the assignment of native Mexican friars to the missions of Alta California.

It seems as if the Mexican government had chosen the College of Guadalupe to supply new Mexican missionaries as early as March of 1829.[40] It is certain that early in 1831, Commissary-Prefect García Diego took definite action on the government mandate by sending an expedition of four Zacatecan friars to Alta California in order to investigate the situation first hand. This group included Fathers Mariano Sosa, whom García Diego named as his vice commissary, Francisco Cuculla, Jesús María Martínez,

XUM

and Antonio Ánzar. Traveling by way of Lower California, the group arrived at Mission San Gabriel in April of 1831. In addition to San Gabriel, the Zacatecan friars visited the missions of San Diego, San Luis Rey, San Juan Capistrano, San Buenaventura, and San Luis Obispo. Vice commissary Sosa came with the faculty of administering the Sacrament of Confirmation, which the Fernandino president, Narciso Durán, allowed him to exercise. Accordingly, Sosa confirmed at Mission San Gabriel, the Pueblo of Los Angeles, Mission San Diego, and probably Mission San Luis Rey.[41] One of the four Zacatecans, Fray Antonio Ánzar, remained at Mission San Luis Rey. The others returned to Zacatecas to report to García Diego in January of 1832.[42] Upon consideration of this report, García Diego acquiesced to the government request and set about making arrangements for the Zacatecan mission to Alta California.

It was during these months of preparation in the spring of 1832 that José González Rubio made known his desire to join the expedition. His own college had no missionary commitments in the frontier regions of Mexico.[43] It is not known exactly how González Rubio was informed of the new task which the College of Guadalupe had undertaken; but, since Francisco García Diego had been one of the Zacatecan founders of the College of Zapopan, it is reasonable to assume that substantial communication existed between the two institutions.[44] Accordingly, sometime prior to May 19, 1832, González Rubio requested admission to the College of Guadalupe, for on that date Fray Bernardino Vallejo, the guardian of the college, informed him that the discretory had voted unanimously to allow his incorporation.[45] On May 30, 1832, González Rubio requested and was granted his formal release from the College of Our Lady of Zapopan. And, on the same day, Francisco García Diego assigned the new member of the College of Guadalupe to the missions of Alta California, charging him with the

gospel command to go and work in the Lord's vineyard.[46] The Zacatecan Franciscans who prepared to embark for Alta California in the late spring of 1832 totaled nine friars.[47] They were Francisco García Diego, commissary-prefect, Rafael Moreno, president, Bernardino Pérez, José María Gutiérrez, Jesús María Mercado, Lorenzo Quijas, Antonio Real, José María Real, and José María González Rubio.[48] In addition, Antonio Ánzar, who had remained at Mission San Luis Rey since 1831, was already in Alta California. For this reason, the total number of the Zacatecan group has been reckoned as ten members.[49]

The journey of the Zacatecan friars to Alta California developed into a six-month ordeal. Their exact departure date is uncertain, but most probably they left Zacatecas early in June of 1832. By the time they reached Tepic the traveling allowance of two hundred pesos per friar which the government had provided was nearly exhausted, so they preached and conducted missions there for two months while they waited for a ship.[50] On August 13, 1832, they sailed from San Blas on the Catalina which was bound for Alta California with the newly appointed governor, José Figueroa, on board. But the instability of Mexican politics occasioned further delay when a portion of the crew mutinied, putting the friars and the Governor ashore at Cape San Lucas in Lower California.[51] The Zacatecans, apparently unaware of the distance and the asperity of the terrain, resolved to continue the journey on foot. Two letters from García Diego to Figueroa, one in September and one in October of 1832, attest to the hardship and disappointment which stalked the friars during this episode.[52] By late November, or early December, Figueroa had succeeded in taking the situation in hand. He recalled the friars and they set out once again on the Catalina, this time from Puerto de la Paz. There were no further mishaps and the party landed at Monterey on January 15, 1833.

XUM

At that time there were twenty Spanish Franciscans from the College of San Fernando at Mexico City left in the missions of Alta California.[53] García Diego entered into negotiations with their president, Father Narciso Durán, at Mission San José in order to work out the terms of the cession of certain missions to the Zacatecans. Strong cultural and national loyalties and feelings rendered the circumstances of these discussions extremely fragile. It is a testimony to the character and diplomacy of both administrators that the changes were resolved without delay and with good grace.[54] On February 13, 1833, less than a month after his arrival at Monterey, García Diego published the results of the deliberations. Although Durán had asked the Zacatecans to accept the ten northernmost missions, García Diego protested that he could staff only eight. These were San Francisco Solano, San Rafael, San Francisco de Asís, San José, Santa Clara, San Juan Bautista, Santa Cruz, and San Carlos.[55] It was in this directive that José González Rubio was assigned to Mission San José to replace Father President Durán who was to go to Mission Santa Barbara. The new missionary must have taken up his duties at San José about the first week of April, 1833, since his name began to appear in the official registers of the mission on April 8 of that year.[56]

NOTES

CHAPTER II

[1]For additional background regarding the work of Galvez and Spanish colonization policies cf. Herbert I. Priestly, José de Gálvez, Visitor General of New Spain, 1765-1771 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1916). Herbert E. Bolton, "The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish American Colonies," in Wider Horizons of American History (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967), pp. 107-148.

[2]Cf. Maynard Geiger, The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M. (2 vols.; Washington, D.C.: The Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959) for the most thorough treatment of Serra.

[3]Francis F. Guest, Fermín Francisco de Lasuén (1736-1803, A Biography (Washington D.C.: The Academy of American Franciscan History, 1973), p. xvii. This is the most comprehensive biography of the second father-president of the California missions.

[4]Woodrow James Hansen, The Search for Authority in California 1820-1849 (Oakland: Biobooks, 1960), pp. 4-5. Walton Bean, California: An Interpretative History (San Francisco: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968), p. 60.

[5]Echeandía, Decreto de Emancipación á favor de Neófitos, 1826, in Hubert Howe Bancroft, History of California (5 vols.; San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft and Co., 1885-1886), III, 102.

[6]Hansen, op. cit., p. 10.

[7]Theodore H. Hittell, History of California (4 vols.; San Francisco: N.J. Stone and Co., 1885-1897), II, 106.

[8]Durán to Echeandía, Mission San José, November 13, 1827, BL.

[9]Durán to Martínez, Mission San José, November 28, 1828, AASF.

[10]Durán to Martínez, Mission San José, November 9, 1828, BL.

[11]For examples of these reports from 1827 to 1830 cf. Nos. 3-12 in "The Writings of Narciso Durán," BL.

[12]Durán to Herrera, Mission San José, June 10, 1826, BL.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Durán to Herrera, Mission San José, September 10, 1826, AASF.

[15]Durán to Herrera, Mission San José, October 13, 1826, AASF.

[16]Durán to Herrera, Mission San José, February 24, 1827, BL. Durán to Echeandía, Mission San José, May 1, 1827, AASF.

[17]Echeandía, Plan para convertir en Pueblos las Misiones, 1829-1830. Bancroft, op. cit., III, 103, 302. Gerald J. Geary, The Secularization of the California Missions (1810-1846) (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1934), p. 109. Hansen, loc. cit.

[18]Hansen, op. cit., p. 12. For a thorough treatment of colonization activity in Mexican California cf. C. Alan Hutchinson, Frontier Settlement in Mexican California (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).

[19]Durán to Bustamante, Mission San José, May 10, 1830, BL.

[20]Durán to Bustamante, Mission San José, September 23, 1830. cf. Zephyrin Engelhardt, The Missions and Missionaries of California (4 vols.; San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1908-1915), III, 337-344. This standard and classic work is based upon a formidable collection of primary sources. In regard to objectivity and interpretation, however, Engelhardt is unabashedly pro-Franciscan.

[21]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 341.

[22]Echeandía, Decreto de Secularización de Misiones, 6 de Enero, 1831. Translated in Bancroft, op. cit., III, 305. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 379. Geary, op. cit., p. 113. Hittell, op. cit., II, 123-124.

[23]Cf. Geary, op. cit., pp. 70-74. Hansen, op. cit., p. 3.

[24]Bancroft, loc. cit.

[25]Durán, Notas y Comentarios al Bando de Echeandía sobre las Misiones, 1831, BL. A full translation of this document may be found in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 379 ff.

[26]Bancroft, op. cit., III, 309.

[27]Cf. note 20 above.

XUM

[28]"Gente llamada de razón." This term appears in note 27 of the commentary of 1831 and is scattered throughout Durán's letters. It is a rather cynical variation of the term "gente de razon" which was the customary appellation of the non-Indian population.

[29]Echeandía, Reglamento de Secularización, 18 de Nov., 1832. Translated in Bancroft, op. cit., III, 314-315. cf., Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 422. Geary, op. cit., p. 127.

[30]Durán, Notas á una circular ó Bando intimado por El Sr. D. José María Echeandía a los quatro Misiones, 1832, BL. Translated in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 422 ff.

[31]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 265.

[32]For a list of these Fernandino missionaries in California cf. ibid., III, 269-272. Three additional friars arrived from Mexico in 1827 who were considered loyal Mexicans.

[33]Ibid., III, 269.

[34]For comprehensive information concerning the Missionary College of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Zacatecas, cf., José Antonio Alcocer, Bosquejo de la historia del Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y sus Misiones (Mexico: Editorial Parrua, 1958). Cuauhtemoc Esparza Sánchez, Compendio histórico del Colegio Apostólico de Propaganda Fide de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas (Mexico: 1957). José Francisco Sotomayor, Historia del Apostólico Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas (Zacatecas: Manuel Ceniceros, 1889).

[35]Bancroft, op. cit., III, 319.

[36]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 407. Francis J. Weber, Francisco García Diego (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1971), p. 11.

[37]A manuscript copy of this sermon is located in the Santa Barbara Mission archives. It runs to a length of forty pages. cf., Weber, loc. cit.

[38]Ibid., p. 8.

[39]Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, p. 98.

[40]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 407, note 12.

XUM

[41]For details of the Zacatecan visit to Alta California in 1831 cf. ibid., III, 407-409. This was the first time that the Sacrament of Confirmation had been administered in Alta California in twenty-eight years, since the death of Fermín Francisco de Lasuén in 1803. cf. ibid., III, 409, note 19.

[42]Weber, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

[43]José Asencio, op. cit., pp. 67-69.

[44]Ibid., p. 65. Weber, op. cit., p. 10.

[45]Vallejo to González Rubio, Zacatecas, May 19, 1832, SBMA.

[46]González Rubio to the Discretory, Zapopan, May 30, 1832, SBMA. García Diego to González Rubio, Zacatecas, May 30, 1832, SBMA. cf. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 30.

[47]Weber, op. cit., p. 13.

[48]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 442.

[49]There has been confusion concerning this number because José Figueroa, in a letter dated September 24, 1832, referred to ten friars who were traveling with him to Alta California. At one point, Engelhardt mentions the possibility of there being eleven friars in the Zacatecan group, but then states that, if this is so, he cannot locate the eleventh friar in any extant records. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 445 note 8, 453 note 33.

[50]Weber, loc. cit.

[51]Ibid., p. 14.

[52]García Diego to Figueroa, San José del Cabo, September 5, 1832, AASF. García Diego to Figueroa, San José del Cabo, October 6, 1832, AASF. cf. Engelhardt, op.cit., III, 343-344.

[53]Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 447, note 12.

[54]For Duran's response to these events cf. ibid., III, 447-451.

[55]Ibid., III, 452-453.

[56]Geiger, loc. cit.

XUM

CHAPTER III

MISSION SAN JOSÉ (1833-1842)

In spite of the relatively calm and prudent negotiations which had transpired between Fathers Narciso Durán and Francisco García Diego, the transfer of the eight Northern missions from Fernandino to Zacatecan control was bound to be fraught with tension. It occasioned replacing familiar friends with strangers. This was especially true from the perspective of the Indians over whom the Zacatecans were to exercise authority. The problem of Indian control had been exacerbated by the plans for secularization and emancipation which José María Echeandía, the former governor, and José María Padrés, the adjutant inspector and would-be colonizer, had circulated among the Indian population.[1] In addition, the tensions which existed among the native Californian leaders, the Mexican civil administrators, and the missionaries, concerning the status and obligations of the missions in regard to the material support of the army were not significantly diminished by the arrival of the Mexican Franciscans.

The protagonist in the native Californian attack on the mission system for its alleged cruelty toward the Indians and recalcitrance in providing supplies for the presidios was Comandante Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo.[2] In May of 1833, not quite four months after the Zacatecans had arrived, he issued a scathing attack on the temporal and spiritual administration of the Franciscans in the missions.[3] The comandante claimed to base his allegations on negotiations he had conducted with both pagan and Christian Indians, whose unrest they themselves attributed to the

severity of the punishments meted out to them by the missionaries. Accordingly, Vallejo charged the friars with "cruelty" and "bad faith" in their administration of the "bloody" mission system. He said he could produce examples of such missionary behavior, but out of politeness he declined to do so. García Diego and other Zacatecans countered Vallejo's charges with discussions concerning the punishments which were appropriate and useful in the missions, but these discussions were inconclusive.[4]

Vallejo also continued to press the missions to provide supplies for his troops, so the Zacatecans found themselves caught in the same dilemma as their Fernandino predecessors. They were called upon to supply the army while being forced to sustain a constant stream of criticism for making the Indians produce ever greater amounts of provisions. On June 15, 1833, García Diego appealed to Governor Figueroa for vindication and relief from Vallejo's demands and complaints.[5] The Zacatecan commissary-prefect expressed amazement and frustration that no amount of missionary good will could overcome Vallejo's negative attitudes. Ten days later, the friar again protested to Figueroa that the army was receiving everything the missions were able to provide.[6]

San José Mission, to which José González Rubio had been assigned, was one of the most productive in Alta California.[7] Accordingly, demands from Vallejo for produce and supplies were very quick in coming. On May 20, 1833, about seven weeks after assuming the administration of Mission San José, González Rubio communicated his attitude concerning the demands of the army to García Diego.[8] He informed his commissary-prefect that he would supply everything his mission could spare for the use of the military, while making it very clear that his primary obligation was to the Indians of his mission who would always be given preference. In the following month, González Rubio informed Governor Figueroa of the supplies which he had provided in

answer to Vallejo's requisition of June 5, 1833.[9] They included sixty fanegas of corn, ten fanegas of horse beans, two fanegas of lentils, two fanegas of garbanzos, half a fanega of peas, and some soap worth about twenty dollars. In his letter to the Governor, the friar included a copy of Vallejo's requisition, dated June 5, 1833, which must have contained more of Vallejo's harsh words about the Franciscans. The young missionary complained to Figueroa that he was contributing all that his mission could bear, and said that he resented the indirect personal insult which Vallejo's words implied.

During the remainder of 1833, González Rubio addressed three more letters to Figueroa. The first, dated August 8, 1833, asked the Governor to insure that the proper receipts were issued by the presidio at San Francisco for supplies which his mission had provided. The second letter, that of December 13, 1833, assured the Governor of González Rubio's continuing compliance with governmental orders, within the limits of his responsibility to his mission. And the following day, the friar asked Figueroa to reciprocate by aiding him in combatting recurrent cases of thievery at Mission San José.[10]

The picture of González Rubio which emerged at the end of his first year in the missions of Alta California is that of a capable and co-operative administrator who quickly discerned the paradoxical currents in the affairs of the missions. He sought to meet the demands of civil and military leaders, while keeping as his primary concern his obligation to the Indians at his mission. Although he held no other office than that of a simple missionary, he did not hesitate to correspond directly with the governor and other secular leaders shortly after assuming his post. This willingness to enter fully into the task of administration marked González Rubio as a candidate, albeit a reluctant one, for more responsibility in the future.

XUM

In 1833 and 1834 the political function and status of the missions and the missionaries were in flux. On April 4, 1833, Governor Figueroa requested Francisco García Diego to administer the founding of new missions even farther north than Sonoma. This he asked in light of the Russian presence on the northern frontier. The friar answered three days later that his desire was always to serve the Supreme Government of the Mexican Republic and to do everything possible to preserve the territory of his beloved country, but that it was physically and economically impossible for him to found and support new mission establishments.[11]

Within a year, however, the governmental pleas for missionary aid were totally reversed. On May 22, 1834, Figueroa sent a long letter to Father President Narciso Durán at Mission Santa Barbara informing him that the latest orders from the central government at Mexico City dictated the enforcement of a total separation of Church and state.[12] He informed the friar that the Church was neither to support nor oppose the government. Apparently García Diego had also been warned by Figueroa. On June 20, 1834, he sent a letter to all the Zacatecan friars informing them of these new orders and charging them to refrain from even the remotest involvement in politics in their preaching and teaching.[13]

Against the background of this renewed emphasis on the separation of Church and state, four major government moves toward the secularization of the missions were put into effect in 1833 and 1834. On July 15, 1833, provisional regulations for a continuation of secularization were issued by Governor Figueroa. On August 17, 1833, the Mexican Congress enacted a federal law for secularization. In August of 1834, Figueroa issued a definitive order to the same effect. And three months later, on November 3, 1834,

XUM

additional regulations were issued for the control of resulting abuses.[14] At the center of this political activity was the effort of the native Californian leaders to continue the process of secularization, but also to insure that the benefits which might result would accrue to them, and not to the would-be colonists who had been sent by Valentín Gómez Farías, the new liberal Mexican president, under the leadership of José María Padrés and José María Hijar.

The year 1835 witnessed another shift in the political climate in Mexico. With the accession of Antonio López de Santa Anna to the presidency of Mexico and his appointment of Mariano Chico to the governorship of California, a centralizing tendency in the government at Mexico City was injected into the problem of secularization in California. On November 7, 1835, an order was issued in Mexico suspending the secularization process.[15] This order has been interpreted as an attempt to arrest the conveyance of the mission lands and wealth solely into the hands of the native Californians for fear they would gain too much of a sense of independence from the central government.[16] Governor Chico, however, refrained from enforcing this order because of its impracticality.

The Fernandino response to these events may be traced in the correspondence of Father President Narciso Durán between 1833 and 1837.[17] In general, his letters expressed hope, outrage, frustration, and confusion at the vacillating policies of the civil government in regard to the missions. The correspondence of the Mexican Zacatecans was less copious and, when it was negative, it was limited to requests for specific reforms rather than to indictments of the motives and governmental policies which gave impetus to the secularization process. García Diego penned two letters in the spring and summer of 1835 to Governor Figueroa in which he asked for some very specific

XUM

considerations regarding the sustenance of the friars, the maintenance of worship, and the responsibilities of the lay population. Never wishing to represent religion as obstructive to the aspirations of Mexican nationhood, the Zacatecan superior stressed the positive contribution which the friars were attempting to make:

> In all this, Sir, I have the good of the territory at heart; and you know that without religion nothing will go well. The ministers of religion should be respected by men, and they should have the means to subsist and to conduct divine worship. And if the faithful do not provide this, to which they are bound, we cannot be held responsible for the spiritual tasks, to which we are bound.[18]

Jose González Rubio's correspondence at Mission San José, first as a simple missionary and after 1838 as president and vice commissary-prefect of the Northern missions, indicated a man who was in basic agreement with the political and social ideals of Mexican nationalism, yet frustrated by practical drawbacks and administrative inefficiency on the part of secular leaders. While he accepted the injunction against clerical involvement in politics, González Rubio was not afraid to accept or reject intervention in the affairs of his mission according to the welfare of the Indian community and to demand governmental efficiency in financial and commercial dealings. In 1834, as the final secularization legislation was being promulgated, the friar wrote to Governor Figueroa and the Presidios of Monterey and San Francisco asking that the bills which they received with each shipment of goods from his mission be processed and returned to him after each transaction, rather than collectively at the end of the year. He begged the Governor to forgive the apparent impertinence of his request and assured him that he only wished to keep the mission accounts correct and orderly.[19] In the fall of 1834, the friar again requested the Gover-

XUM

nor's forbearance, this time for his inability to send requisitioned supplies. His tone was conciliatory rather than defensive as he explained that he could not give what he did not possess.[20]

In November of 1835, when González Rubio was asked to contribute money toward the salary of José María Moreno, the local director of the public school, he responded that his obedience to the government had led him to make such a contribution earlier in the year, but that a second payment was now impossible because of the financial situation of his mission.[21] And a year later, in October of 1836, the friar reported to Governor Nicolás Gutiérrez on the agricultural produce at Mission San José, telling him that an accurate accounting was impossible because of the chaotic civil administration of commercial transactions, but that he and his Indians had enough to eat.[22] In the following month, on November 29, 1836, González Rubio's responsibility for the temporal affairs of Mission San José was terminated when the mission was legally secularized. José de Jesús Vallejo was appointed administrator of the mission with full responsibility for its economic management.[23]

On November 30, 1838, after González Rubio had accepted the appointment as president and vice commissary-prefect of the Zacatecan missions, he sent a letter to Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, congratulating him on his appointment as commandant-general of the army in California.[24] In effect, this represents the friar's acceptance of the authority of Juan Bautista Alvarado, who emerged from the political chaos of 1836 and 1837 as the new Governor in October of 1838.[25]

The year 1839 marked the end of a decade in which the stable Indian population residing at the missions of Alta California dwindled from about 18,000 to only a few hundred.[26] This was one of the results of five years of

concerted effort to secularize the missions. At the beginning of 1839 Governor Alvarado drafted a plan which was calculated to regularize mission administration. On January 17, 1839, he issued a decree reorganizing the administration of the missions, the central characteristic of which was the appointment of William Hartnell, an English merchant, as visitador-general of the mission affairs.[27] Narciso Durán, the Fernandino president, responded very positively to Alvarado's intervention, but he did not fail to issue specific criticisms as problems arose.[28] On February 5, 1839, González Rubio addressed a letter to the Governor in which he expressed his approval of Alvarado's program and asserted his hope that the missions would return to their former state of prosperity for the welfare of the Indians, as well as the good of the entire population of California.[29]

By the end of 1839 continued degeneration in mission affairs forced Alvarado and Hartnell to consider further reforms. Responding to queries from the governor and visitador-general, González Rubio answered, on December 29, 1839, that such action would certainly be desirable, but that he wished to forestall any resumption of responsibility for the temporal affairs of the missions on the part of the friars.[30] On March 1, 1840, Alvarado issued the new decree which lowered the salaries of secular administrators in the hope of diminishing the temptation to manage the mission accounts with an eye to self-interest.[31] Again Durán's response was positive but cautious.[32] González Rubio responded to the decree in a lengthy letter to Governor Alvarado on March 9, 1840.[33] The friar enthusiastically accepted the new regulation, stating his belief that it should be carried out not by force, but in a spirit of co-operation which worked toward the welfare of the Indians. He pledged to direct the missionaries under his administration to spare neither bother,

XUM

nor work, nor sacrifice in co-operating with the decree in the hope that this would return financial stability to the missions. He asked that sufficient money be allotted for the maintenance of worship. González Rubio's closing remarks to the Governor were a plea that the missionaries be allowed to remain sufficiently free of the arbitrary will of the secular administrators, and that both be made answerable to the government for the state of their mission.

On March 24, 1840, Hartnell wrote to González Rubio promising his co-operation in applying the new regulation by close supervision of mission finances and careful selection of secular personnel so that it would concretely benefit both the Indians and the friars.[34] The visitador-general also asked González Rubio to participate in the selection of a new administrator for his mission at San José. This González Rubio refused to do, protesting that on principle he wished to refrain from undue participation in matters which were technically in the hands of the secular government.[35] The new regulation was first applied at Mission San José where, in the following month of April, 1840, José Vallejo was replaced as administrator by José María Amador.[36] José González Rubio remained on cordial terms with the Alvarado government for the duration of his stay at Mission San José, which was terminated by his removal to Mission Santa Barbara early in 1842.[37]

The prudence, diplomacy, and administrative ability which José González Rubio demonstrated as a missionary at San José did not go unnoticed by his superiors. In the spring of 1835, Narciso Durán and Francisco García Diego met at Santa Barbara to agree upon a united Franciscan response to the problems of mission secularization. It was decided that García Diego would go personally to Mexico to represent the Franciscan case. After traveling

through the Northern missions, he departed for Mexico on November 17, 1835.[38] It was during the period of García Diego's expected departure, when the Zacatecan administration in California was being reorganized, that José González Rubio was given his first administrative office. On June 24, 1835, Father Miguel Sosa, the guardian of the College of Guadalupe at Zacatecas, sent a letter to the friar informing him that he had been appointed to the presidency of the Zacatecan missions in Alta California.[39] At that point, the young missionary displayed the distaste for the burden of power and the prestige of office which was to remain with him until the end of his life by resigning the proferred presidency. His resignation was accepted by the College of Guadalupe on September 18, 1835.[40]

But González Rubio's seeming escape from the burden of office was really only a brief reprieve. Two years later, on June 19, 1837, he was again appointed to the presidency.[41] In the following month García Diego sent the official letters patent appointing González Rubio as both president and vice commissary-prefect of the Zacatecan missions:

> By the letters patent which I am forwarding to you, you are notified that it is the will of God that you be president and vice-commissary of these missions in spite of all your resignations. . . Arm yourself with patience, obey, and give glory to the Lord.[42]

All avenues of escape were blocked and González Rubio accepted the office deeply convinced of his inadequacy for the task.[43] And the task was indeed a difficult one:

> This was the charge entrusted to González Rubio: a land of crumbling missions, decimated herds and uncared for fields, a land of scattered Indians who had now learned to hate and fear these white men, a small core of old missionaries, once so hearty, but now old and tired, defeated by harsh years and bitter circumstances.[44]

XUM

But González Rubio's performance as president, even in the face of such trying circumstances, must have pleased his superiors at Zacatecas. On July 22, 1840, letters patent were issued appointing the friar to another term in his double office.[45] A week later, Rafael de Jesus Soría, newly-elected commissary-prefect of the missions of the College of Guadalupe, sent a letter to González Rubio explaining that he was the only candidate for the offices who had an adequate knowledge of the nature of the missionary ministry, the actual state of the missions, and the needs of the missionaries and the Indians.[46]

The administrative and pastoral abilities of of José González Rubio did not escape the notice of Narciso Durán, the Fernandino president at Mission Santa Barbara, who also held the office of vicar-forane of the Bishop of Sonora in the Southern missions. This exercise of episcopal authority in the Southern missions was part of the ferment in Catholic polity which would issue in the erection of the Diocese of Both Californias in 1840. Durán wished González Rubio to exercise the office of vicar-forane of the bishop in the North as he himself did in the South. Accordingly, on September 25, 1838, he petitioned Bishop Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros to grant the appointment to González Rubio and, on March 25, 1839, the bishop agreed to do so.[47] On September 15, 1839, Durán informed González Rubio that the bishop wished to grant him powers as vicar-forane, especially to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation and to judge regarding exceptions and impediments in marriage cases.[48] Two days later Durán sent another letter to González Rubio, informing him that the Bishop of Sonora had finally split the jurisdiction of the Southern and Northern missions completely, and therefore it was imperative that he accept the vicar-foraneship without awaiting the permission of

the superiors of his college.[49]

Both Durán and González Rubio regarded their exercise of this office as an interim measure until the appointment of a bishop for California became a reality. On December 18, 1839, González Rubio drafted a letter to Bishop Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros informing the prelate that he would accept the office of vicar-forane for the Northern missions while he anxiously awaited the advent of direct episcopal authority in California.[50] Again González Rubio protested his unworthiness, but pledged to represent the bishop and the sacred mitre with all his zeal and prudence. On the same day the friar sent a circular letter to the other Zacatecan missionaries informing them that it was imperative for him to accept the office, albeit without prior approval of the superiors of the College of Guadalupe, lest control of the Northern missions be lost to them and their college.[51]

Early the following year, on February 1, 1840, García Diego informed González Rubio that his action regarding the office of vicar-forane had been approved at the College of Guadalupe.[52] At the beginning of 1840, then, González Rubio held the offices of president of the Northern missions, vice commissary-prefect of the Northern missions, and vicar-forane of the Bishop of Sonora for the northern portion of the Department of Alta California. He was the principal agent of Catholic authority, both diocesan and religious, in the area. This was ample testimony to the respect his superiors and colleagues accorded to González Rubio's pastoral zeal and administrative talent.

With the advent of 1840 the impetus for creating a diocese embracing Upper and Lower California gained momentum. On February 1, 1840, González Rubio was informed that Francisco García Diego had been elected by the Metropolitan Chapter and approved by the Supreme Government as the first Bishop of the Californias.[53] Pope Gregory XVI

acted to erect the Diocese of Both Californias and to appoint García Diego as its first bishop on April 17, 1840.[54] In February of 1841, Rafael Soría, the guardian of the College of Guadalupe, informed González Rubio that the new bishop wanted him to serve as his secretary, in which case he was free to resign the offices of president and vice commissary-prefect to which he had been reappointed in 1840.[55] Although he was wary about the status of the friars and the authority of the new bishop, González Rubio accepted the assignment and, on December 12, 1841, García Diego wrote from San Diego asking him to join the episcopal residence as his secretary and confessor.[56]

In addition to the diplomacy of Church-state relations and the responsibility of administrative offices, José González Rubio was concerned with the practical pastoral and administrative tasks which his position as missionary at San José entailed. Although he executed numerous inventories and reports between 1833 and 1842, they provide only the statistical framework of his experience as a missionary.[57] The friar left a more personal impression of the mission system upon his arrival in 1833, and facts concerning the state of Mission San José in 1837, in a letter directed to Father Joachim Adam, the pastor at Santa Cruz, California, dated September, 1864:

> "Reverend and Dear Sir:
> On my landing in this country, which happened on the 15th of January, 1833, there were in existence from San Diego up to San Francisco Solano twenty-one missions, which provided for 14,000 to 15,000 Indians. Even the poorest Missions, that of San Rafael and Soledad, provided everything for divine worship, and the maintenance of the Indians. The care of the neophytes was left to the missionary, who, not only as pastor, instructed them, but as a householder, provided for them, governed and instructed them in their social life, procuring for them peace and happiness.

"Every mission, rather than a town, was a large community, in which the missionary was president, distributing equally the burdens and benefits. No one worked for himself, and the products of the harvest, cattle and industry in which they were employed were guarded, administered, and distributed by the missionary. He was the procurator and defender of his neophytes, and, at the same time, their Chief and Justice of the Peace, to settle all their quarrels, since the Mission Indians were not subject to the public authorities, except in grievous and criminal cases.

"This system, though criticized by some politicians, is the very one that made the Missions so flourishing. The richest in population was that of San Luis Rey; in temporal things, that of San Gabriel. Mine was that of San José, and, although I was promised, as it was on the gentile frontier, it would not be secularized, it, too, succumbed in 1836.

"In the inventory made in January, 1837, the result showed that said Mission numbered 1,300 neophytes, a great piece of land, well tilled; the store houses filled with seeds; two orchards, one with 1,600 fruit trees; two vineyards, one with 6,039 vines, the other with 5,000; tools for husbandry in abundance; shops for carpenters, blacksmiths, shoemakers, and even tanneries, and all the implements for their work.

"The fields were covered with livestock: horned cattle, 20,000 head; sheep, 15,000; horses, 459. For the saddle, 600 colts of two years, 1,630 mares; 149 yoke of oxen, 30 mules, 18 jackasses, and 77 hogs.

"Twice a year a new dress was given to the neophytes, amounting in the distribution to $6,000. When the Mission was secularized, I delivered to the Major-domo then in charge some $20,000 worth of cloth and other articles which the store house contained.

"The church of the Mission of San Jose was neatly adorned, and well provided with vestments and other religious articles. Thirty musicians served in the choir, and they had a very neat dress for the feast days."[58]

These impressions indicate that González Rubio engaged in all the aspects of his missionary vocation in

earnest. Central to this vocation was the exercise of the sacramental ministry of the priest. In February of 1839 the friar sent a detailed enquiry to Father President Narciso Durán concerning the method of investigating special marriage cases in which dispensations or special permissions might be required. Durán responded on March 20, 1839, giving his Zacatecan colleague specific directions regarding reports to be submitted, theological manuals to be consulted, testimony to be taken, and possible problems which might arise. He urged González Rubio to decide such cases judiciously and to grant whatever dispensations his office allowed.[59] González Rubio may have asked this advice in order to deal properly with the request of no less a person than Governor Alvarado himself, since the friar officiated at the private wedding ceremony of the Governor and Martina Castro after dispensing with the banns and allowing Alvarado to be married by proxy on August 24, 1839.[60] The friar's concern to insure theological propriety was a mark of his reverence for the priestly office. As vicar-forane of the Northern portion of the Department of Alta Calfiornia, González Rubio also possessed the faculty of administering the sacrament of Confirmation which he exercised at the various missions under his administration.[61]

Most of González Rubio's priestly activity, however, was exercised at his own mission at San José. During his years as missionary there he lavished much care on the mission church, especially in light of the twenty-fifth anniversary of its dedication which was celebrated in April of 1834.[62] The friar had the church whitewashed and the interior woodwork repainted. He had a railing constructed for the choir, arranged for a refinishing of the ceiling, and had a window opened in the north wall to balance one already present in the south wall.

XUM

The main entrance of the church, as well as the two side entrances, was embellished with elaborate ornamentation.[63]

In addition to refurbishing the church building itself, González Rubio personally worked to render the church's interior a proper setting for learning the teachings of religion, receiving the sacraments and worshipping. He himself designed the Nativity scene to be placed in the sanctuary for the Christmas season. He painted a curtain which covered the entire front of the church with scenes from the Christmas story, as well as the scenery to be placed near the Altar of Repose in the Holy Thursday liturgy. He invested two hundred pesos in a new tabernacle, the quality of which disappointed him. In addition to the works of his own brush the friar hung in the church six devotional paintings from France and depictions of the fourteen Stations of the Cross encased in gold frames. Following a Mexican custom, he placed four framed mirrors on the main altar and twelve framed mirrors on the church's side walls.[64] A visitor to the church at Mission San José in 1854, twelve years after González Rubio's departure for Santa Barbara, praised the building's interior, mentioning especially the broad tile floor, the multitude of paintings, the rich ornamentation around the main altar and the fresco-covered walls.[65]

José González Rubio also took an active concern in the celebration of the liturgy and the quality of the worship services at his mission. His predecessor at San José, Father Narciso Durán, had set a high standard of liturgical activity by organizing and directing an Indian choir and ensemble at the mission which had a reputation for excellence throughout the mission system. In addition, Durán composed music for the Indian musicians.[66] González Rubio strove to carry on the liturgical tradition at Mission San José and to maintain the Indian choir and musicians. Seven years after he took over the choir, in

1840, González Rubio reported that the ensemble still contained sixteen violins, two cellos, and that it had been augmented by the addition of a new bass fiddler. This was in addition to the Indian singers.[67]

José González Rubio's concern for worship was not limited to the Indian community at his mission. It also extended to the lay population, especially the residents of the nearby Pueblo of San José. In 1839 and 1840 the friar engaged in a fund-raising campaign to build a parish church at the pueblo. In June of 1839 he told Governor Alvarado that many pledges of contributions had been made, but that little cash was coming in because of the economic instability of the area. The missionary spoke of the mission resources being squandered by José Vallejo, the administrator, when they could have been shared with the lay populace in their efforts to erect the church. Finally, he told the Governor that out of his poverty he was contributing nine hundred pesos and asked Alvarado if perhaps he could match the sum, or at least contribute something to the church project.[68]

In the following month, July of 1839, González Rubio sent two letters to Manuel Jimeno, Acting Governor of California, tracing the legislation since 1833 giving the ayuntamiento, or town council, of Pueblo San José the right to collect tithes for the maintenance of public worship and thanking Jimeno for the personal donation which he had made. The friar expatiated on the necessity that the lay population be responsible for maintaining worship in general, not just during the construction of one particular church, and closed with a plea that the acting governor aid in the collection of pledged funds for the church so that contracts with suppliers and workers could be honored.[69] In the spring and summer of the following year, 1840, Alvarado himself took the matter in

hand by granting the power to the Justice of the Peace of the Pueblo of San José to enforce the collection of the tithes. González Rubio thanked the governor for his intervention and asked if he could extend the authority to collect building funds until the end of 1841, to which the governor agreed.[70]

During the nine years that José González Rubio was the missionary at San José, he was called upon to offer hospitality to visitors and travellers. Two entries in the diary of Faxon Dean Atherton spoke of his stay at Mission San José in May of 1836.[71] After describing José González Rubio as one who seemed "to be in appearance and manners very much of a gentleman" and inferring "from his way of conducting the affairs of the Mision [sic] that he was a very capable man," the visitor went on to chronicle the events and sights of his two days at the mission.

In his entry for Sunday, May 8, 1836, Atherton wrote the following:

> "In the evening we went to a play performed by the Indian boys and girls of the Mision [sic], being taught by the schoolmaster who appears to be a person of considerable information. They have a band of about 20 pieces of music, and I should think some pieces were executed very well. However, I am no great judge in those matters. After the play was ended, about 11 o'clock, we set down to a good supper. Although I am no judge of music, I profess to be no bad one of the manner of preparing 'Belly Timber' which, when well done, I can discourse the subject as long as most anyone. After supper this night I can truly say it was most essentially so, and I also feel certain that I have made good stowage of no small portion of what was before me. What greater blessing than a good appetite, especially when the luscious wherewithal to appease it is placed before me.
>
> "Monday, May 9. Rose at 6 A.M.. Feel rather unwell. Have taken a walk around the orchard, and mechanics shops of the place, and am much pleased with the well

> regulated manner of conducting the work. In one part is a blacksmiths shop, in another a carpenters, a card makers, a saddlemaker, wool carders, spinners, weavers, dyers, etc., etc.. Farther back is the slaughter house, some are killing, some trying out tallow (rendering), some spreading hides, all appear to be busy about something. There are also gangs of men in the fields, sowing, some ploughing, some attending the cattle. In front of the Mision [sic], and between that and the houses inhabitated by the Indians, is a large fountain at which there are some 20 or 30 women, washing, laughing and joking. All the young girls of the Mision [sic] are kept locked up nights by themselves, to keep them from mischievious pranks . . . .
>
> "The land belonging to this Mision [sic] is said to be the best of any near here. From the Mision [sic], which is close under the mountains, it gradually slopes down to the head of the Bay of San Francisco, launches from which can go up the different creeks as far as within 3 leagues of the Mision [sic]. This year there has been 196 fanegas of wheat sown and it now looks extremely well and promises abundantly, but they are fearful there will be too much rain. There are about 1500 Indians attached to this Mision [sic] and it owns about 15,000 head of cattle and horses."[72]

Two years later, in 1838, William Heath Davis, then a young man of sixteen working in the employ of his uncle, Nathan Spear, in Monterey, visited González Rubio at Mission San José and left the following impression of the friar:

> He was a noble man, a true Christian, very much respected and beloved by all his people, and by all who knew him. Whenever I went there he always welcomed me in the most cordial manner, and the moment I saw him I felt drawn toward him as by a lodestone. He would take me in and say, "Sienta usted hijito" (Sit down, my little son), and seating himself close by my side, he entertained me in such a delightful manner by his conversation, which flowed easily and naturally in a continuous stream, that one hardly realized that he was

only a humble priest. His people greatly honored and loved him, and he was known among them as "The Saint on Earth".[73]

In 1840 and 1841, Count Eugène Duflot de Mofras came to the Pacific Coast to reconnoitre and report on its condition to the French government. Judging from his correspondence, the Count must have developed a substantial friendship with José González Rubio.[74] The Frenchman left a picture of the state of Mission San José, some reflections on its decline and González Rubio's experience near the end of his term as missionary in 1841.

"Today 8,000 cattle, 200 horses, and 9,000 sheep remain. Father González has been able to retain about 400 Indians who are enjoying the spoils of the former mission wealth and appear extremely well fed and dressed. In fact, chiefs or alcaldes were seen fully garbed in woolen garments, with cloaks, trousers, blue vests, waistcoats, red sashes, shirts of white linen, shoes, stockings, broad felt hats, and cravats of black silk.

"This mission, together with San Gabriel and San Luis Rey, offers the most favorable opportunity to study the remarkable system introduced by the Spanish Fathers, of which the Jesuits have the honor of being the founders. The buildings and church are extensive and well preserved. At the rear of the edifice are some fine vines, and a grove of olives, and an extensive orchard filled with fruit trees imported from Europe. A school in which were assembled 60 Indian children who showed amazing facility in learning Spanish, reading, writing, and especially arithmetic, was inspected with considerable interest. Unfortunately, only two or three white children were attending the school, although more than 50 were living in the mission. However, most of the rancheros, who spend their time in gambling and debauchery, pay slight attention to their families.

"Mission San José has been victimized by the relatives of the comandante general, Don Mariano Vallejo, who have grown rich from

> the spoils. Some have carried off the animals; others have taken land and have even built houses opposite the mission with Indian labor and the use of mission material. All the ranchos belonging to the community have been confiscated until scarcely a square league of vacant ground remains around the mission. Notwithstanding, to complete its despoliation and separate the neophytes from their old haunt, an Indian settlement is soon to be formed some distance from the mission, and the natives supplied with livestock which will be confiscated or dissipated by their owners.
>
> "At San José the spectacle of a Father put on rations by the administrator was again witnessed. Each time this building is visited, it was always from Father González that hospitality was sought. This poor monk was then obliged to see the majordomo in order to secure two portions of food, his own rations being sufficient only for one person. And although the administrator was living well and eating white bread, he sent the president a plain piece of beef and some inferior corn cakes. Father González endured these humiliations without complaint, only raising his voice to defend his neophytes against plunder and cruel treatment at the hands of the white men."[75]

Near the end of his tenure as missionary at San José, José González Rubio himself left his reflections on the state of the missions, his disappointments, his criticisms of the methods of secularization, and his uncertainties about the division of authority upon the arrival of García Diego as bishop, in a lengthy report to Father Rafael Soría, the commissary-prefect of the missions of the College of Guadalupe, dated November 3, 1840. Excerpts from the report provide a remarkably clear portrayal of the experiences, concerns, and fears of González Rubio at that stage of his missionary career:

> What can I say to Your Reverence that will not sadden your heart and break it as mine? . . . Everything is destruction, everything misery, humiliation and abandonment . . . .

XUM

> The evil today is certainly irreparable. Our predecessors so entwined the spiritual and temporal interests of these neophytes that one sustained the other. Consequently, when the direction of the temporalities was taken from our hands, everything crashed to the ground....In 1840, I baptized over 100 pagan adults and many children. I have buried 1300 Indians since 1833. I found a bit more than 1300 when I arrived. There are 800 here now....But it seems that the time of building is already past, and our eyes alone are the witnesses of the irreparable ruin, both formal and material, of these missions of Upper California: only God can remedy it, may He deign to do so for His glory.[76]

The friar then spoke sadly yet sympathetically of the lack of support for religion and worship on the part of the laity since the advent of secularization.

> Hence my affliction has come to its highest point, particularly in a country whose inhabitants are accustomed only to receive and not to give alms. And I have no power to demand contributions for the support of worship and ministers; nor, in case that I had it, would it be prudent to insist on it, both because of the insignificance of its results and because it would be very odious to a small population, very poor for the most part and accustomed to be served gratis.[77]

Finally, González Rubio adverted to the problem of jurisdiction which might arise upon the arrival of Bishop García Diego. The missionary betrayed a slight sadness regarding the new episcopal authority, which is not surprising, considering the profound emotion he must have felt as he watched the mission system to which he had devoted his life collapsing before his eyes. But quickly banishing such considerations, González Rubio went on to ask the commissary-prefect to clarify his instructions regarding the matter of jurisdiction:

XUM

> If what Your Reverence instructs me in the letter which I am now answering only amounts to this, that when the bishop comes we should pay him due respects; and, as he goes on naming secular curates or doctrineros from amongst our ~~bre~~thern--who should freely offer themselves--or from among other religious, I should take care to surrender to them, with an exact inventory of the jewelry, ornaments, and the rest of the chattels that may obtain, submitting to the limits that the bishop may assign to each curacy or doctrina; if this, I repeat, is the only thing I must do, I meet with no difficulty in this, and I will instantly give Your Reverence an exact account of the missions surrendered under this form or any other similar to this, informing you at the same time of those among us that remain serving as auxiliary missionaries of the new bishop, until the pastors present themselves and we have the opportunity to found new missions. Yet this is not what is directly deduced from your letter which I have copied, and thus I need from Your Reverence a simple explanation of what has been said, or orders and instructions well detailed that should determine what I must do and how I am to carry it out, so as not to make a mistake in so important an affair, either through my own ignorance or because of lack of instructions at the proper time.[78]

But the fears of González Rubio in this matter were to prove unfounded. His responsibility as president of the Northern missions for the transfer of jurisdiction was canceled when he accepted the bishop's order to remove himself to the episcopal residence at Santa Barbara to function as the prelate's secretary and confessor. On February 15, 1842, González Rubio compiled his last expense list for the mission church at San José.[79] On March 1, 1842, after completing his last official inventory, the name of José González Rubio appeared for the last time in the registers of Mission San José.[80] Shortly after this date, the friar left the mission, arriving at Santa Barbara about the middle of March, 1842.[81]

XUM

NOTES

CHAPTER III

[1]Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, III, 454.

[2]Cf., Myrtle M. McKitrick, Vallejo, Son of California (Portland: Binfords and Mort, 1944).

[3]Vallejo, San Francisco, May 5, 1833, SBMA.

[4]For missionary correspondence regarding the punishment of Indians at the missions cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 454-459.

[5]García Diego to Figueroa, Mission Santa Clara, June 15, 1833, AASF. Translated in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 459-460.

[6]García Diego to Figueroa, n.p., June 25, 1833. Cited in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 460.

[7]San Gabriel, San Luis Rey, and San José were the most agriculturally productive missions in Alta California.

[8]González Rubio to García Diego, Mission San José, May 20, 1833, AASF.

[9]González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, June 22, 1833, AASF. cf.Engelhardt, loc. cit.

[10]González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, August 8, 1833, AASF. González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, December 13, 1833, AASF. González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, December 14, 1833, AASF.

[11]García Diego to Figueroa, Mission Santa Clara, April 15, 1833, BL.

[12]Figueroa to Durán, Monterey, May 22, 1834, SBMA.

[13]García Diego, circular letter, Mission Santa Clara, June 20, 1834, SBMA.

[14]Figueroa, Prevenciones provisionales para la emancipación de Indios reducidos, 15 de Julio, 1833. Cited in Bancroft, History of California, III, 328 ff.. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 480. Geary, The Secularization of the California Missions, p. 137. Hansen, The Search for Authority, p. 17. Decreto del Congreso Mejicano secularizando las Misiones, 17 de Agosto de 1833. Cited in Bancroft, op. cit., III, 336. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 518-520. Geary, op. cit., p. 146.

Hansen, loc. cit.. Hittell, History of California, II, 181. Kathryn Lee Langston,"The Secularization of the California Missions, 1813-1846" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1925), p. 119. Figueroa, Reglamento Provisional para la secularización de las Misiones de la Alta California, 9 de Agosto, 1834. Cited in Bancroft, op. cit., III, 342. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 523-530. Geary, op. cit., pp. 149-151. Hansen, loc. cit.. Hittell, op. cit., II, 182-188. Langston, loc. cit.. Reglamento de Misiones secularizadas por la Diputación in e de Nov. 1834. Translated in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 530-532. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., III, 347.

[15]Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 44.

[16]Hansen, op. cit., p. 24.

[17]For examples of Durán's correspondence regarding this period in the sucularization process, cf. Durán to Figueroa, February 5, 1833, BL. Durán to Figueroa, n.p., June 7, 1833, BL. Durán to Figueroa, n.p., July 9, 1833, BL. Durán to Figueroa, Crítica sobre las prevenciones de Emancipación, July 16, 1833, BL. Durán to Figueroa, Proyectos de Secularización de Misiones, October 3, 1833, BL. Translated in Engelhardt, op. cit., III, 485 ff.. Durán to Figueroa, Mission Santa Barbara, July 22, 1834, BL. Durán to Chico, Mission Santa Barbara, July 9, 1835, BL. Durán to Chico, Mission Santa Barbara, July 9, 1835, BL. Durán to Chico, July 15, 1835. Cited in Bancroft, op. cit., III, 434. Durán to Chico, Mission Santa Barbara, June 15, 1836. Cited in Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 46. Translated in Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 21-29. Durán to Junta Departmental, Mission Santa Barbara, August 13, 1837, BL. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 15.

[18]García Diego to Figueroa, Mission Santa Barbara, May 29, 1835, SBMA. García Diego to Figueroa, Mission Santa Clara August 3, 1835, SBMA.

[19]González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, August 14, 1834, AASF.

[20]González Rubio to Figueroa, Mission San José, November 25, 1834, AASF.

[21]Castro to missionaries, Monterey, November 17, 1835, AASF. González Rubio to n.n., Mission San José, November 27, 1835,AASF.

[22]González Rubio to Gutiérrez, Mission San José, October 7, 1836, SBMA.

[23]Castro to González Rubio, Monterey, November 29, 1836, SBMA. José de Jesús Vallejo was the brother of Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo. cf. Hubert Howe Bancroft, Register of Pioneer Inhabitants of California 1542 to 1848 (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1964), p. 757.

[24]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 76-77.

[25]Bancroft states that Alvarado dated his accession to the governorship from October 1, 1838. cf. Bancroft, History of California, III, 577.

[26]Hansen, op. cit., p. 32.

[27]Alvarado, Reglamento para Administradores de Misiones, 17 de Enero, 1839. Cited in Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 55. cf. Hansen, op. cit., p. 30. Hittell, op. cit., II,297.

[28]Durán to Alvarado, Mission Santa Barbara, May 13, 1839. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 57. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 147. Durán to Alvarado, Mission Santa Barbara, December 3, 1839, BL. Durán to Hartnell, Mission Santa Barbara, January 1, 1840. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 60. Durán to Hartnell, Mission Santa Barbara, February 15, 1840. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 163.

[29]González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, February 5, 1839, SBMA.

[30]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 170.

[31]Alvarado, Reglamento de Ex-Misiones, 1 de Marzo, 1840. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 59. Hittell, op. cit., II, 300.

[32]Durán to Alvarado, Mission Santa Barbara, April 6, 1840. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 176. Durán to Alvarado, Mission Santa Barbara, April 20, 1840, BL. cf. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[33]González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, March 9, 1840, AASF. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 170.

[34]Hartnell to González Rubio, San José, March 24, 1840, BL.

[35]Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 61. Engelhardt, loc. cit.

[36]Bancroft, op. cit., III, 724.

XUM

[37]For examples of Gonzalez Rubio's correspondence with the Alvarado government, cf. González Rubio to Jimeno, Mission San José, September 28, 1841, AASF. González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, September 28, 1841, AASF. González Rubio to Jimeno, Mission San José, January 5, 1842, AASF.

[38]Weber, Garcia Diego, p. 22.

[39]Sosa to González Rubio, Zacatecas, June 24, 1835, SBMA.

[40]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 80. Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, p. 114.

[41]García Diego to González Rubio, Zacatecas, June 19, 1837, SBMA. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 64. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[42]García Diego to González Rubio, Zacatecas, June 27, 1837, SBMA. ibid..

[43]González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, November 28, 1837, AASF.

[44]Godfrey F. Baur, "González Rubio de la Sagrada Mitra de las Ambas Californias," Priestly Studies, XXII:3 (May, 1954), 111.

[45]Patente, Zacatecas, July 22, 1840, SBMA.

[46]Soria to González Rubio, Zacatecas, July 29, 1840, SBMA. Bancroft, loc. cit..

[47]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 120-122.

[48]Durán to González Rubio, Mission Santa Barbara, September 15, 1839, SBMA. ibid..

[49]Durán to González Rubio, Mission Santa Barbara, September 17, 1839, SBMA. ibid..

[50]González Rubio to Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros, Mission San Jose, October 18, 1839, SBMA.

[51]Bancroft, loc. cit., note 37. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[52]García Diego to González Rubio, Zacatecas, February 1, 1840, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[53]Ibid.

XUM

[54]Pope Gregory XVI, Rome, April 27, 1840, SBMA.

[55]Soria to González Rubio, Zacatecas, February 9, 1841, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 115.

[56]García Diego to González Rubio, Mission San Diego, December 12, 1841, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit.. Geiger, loc. cit..

[57]Inventory of Mission San José, January 15, 1837, SBMA. Inventory of Mission San José, March, 1833, to 1840, SBMA. Annual report, Mission San José, December 31, 1840, SBMA. Inventory of Mission San José, March 1, 1842, SBMA.

[58]González Rubio to Adam, Mission Santa Barbara, September, 1864, SBMA. Translated in P.J. Thomas, Our Centennial Memoir (San Francisco: By the author, 1877), pp. 41-42. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., III, 724.

[59]Durán to González Rubio, Mission Santa Barbara, March 20, 1839, SBMA.

[60]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 125.

[61]González Rubio, list of persons confirmed, Mission San Francisco Solano, 1840, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., 114.

[62]Mission San José was founded in 1797. The church building which was in use when González Rubio arrived in 1833 was dedicated by Father Esteban Tapis on April 22, 1809. Frances Florence McCarthy and Raymund F. Wood, The History of Mission San José California 1797-1835 (Fresno: Academy Library Guild, 1958), p. 123.

[63]Ibid., p. 124.

[64]Ibid.

[65]The Alta California (San Francisco), October 1, 1854. Cited in McCarthy and Wood, loc. cit., note 14.

[66]For an eyewitness account of Father Durán and his Indian choir cf. Alfred Robinson, Life in California (Santa Barbara: Peregrine Publishers, Inc., 1970), p. 80.

[67]McCarthy and Wood, op. cit., p. 232.

[68]González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, June 22, 1839, AASF.

[69]González Rubio to Jimeno, Mission Santa Clara, July 3, 1839, AASF. González Rubio to Jimeno, Mission San José, July 18, 1839, AASF.

[70]González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, May 5, 1840, AASF. González Rubio to Alvarado, Mission San José, July 10, 1840, AASF.

[71]At the time of this visit in 1836, Atherton was a young clerk in the employ of Alpheus B. Thompson. He was later to rise to prominence in the commercial and business life of California. cf. Doyce B. Nunis, Jr. (ed.), The California Diary of Faxon Dean Atherton (San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1964), p. xiii.

[72]Ibid., pp. 9-10.

[73]William Heath Davis, Seventy-Five Years in California (San Francisco: John Howell, 1929), p. 58.

[74]Cf. Duflot de Mofras to González Rubio, Monterey, June 10, 1841, SBMA. Duflot de Mofras to González Rubio, Monterey, July 9, 1841, SBMA. Duflot de Mofras to González Rubio, Monterey, August 21, 1841, SBMA. Duflot de Mofras to Gonzalez Rubio, San Diego, January 23, 1842, SBMA.

[75]Marguerite Eyer Wilbur, Duflot de Mofras' Travels on the Pacific Coast (2 vols.,Santa Ana: The Fine Arts Press, 1937),I, 222-224.

[76]González Rubio to Soria, Mission San José, November 3, 1840, SBMA.

[77]Ibid.

[78]Ibid., cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 214-219.

[79]González Rubio, expense list, Mission San José, February 15, 1842, SBMA.

[80]Inventory of Mission San José, March 1, 1842, SBMA.

[81]Geiger, loc. cit.

CHAPTER IV

THE BISHOP'S SECRETARY (1842-1846)

Although Pope Gregory XVI, in erecting the Diocese of Both Californias, had stipulated that San Diego was to be the episcopal residence, it did not take the new bishop long to decide to reside instead at Santa Barbara. The bishop felt that the population and resources of the latter city would be more favorable to the administration of the new diocese. On January 11, 1842, one month and one day after his arrival at San Diego, García Diego stepped ashore at Santa Barbara amidst an abundance of pomp and ceremony. An eyewitness left the following account of the bishop's welcome:

> The vessel was in sight on the morning of the 11th of January, 1842, but lay becalmed and rolling to the ocean's swell. A boat put off from her side, and approached the landing-place. One of the attendants of his Excellency, who came in it, repaired to the Mission to communicate with the Father President. All was bustle; men, women and children hastening to the beach, banners flying, drums beating, and soldiers marching. The whole population of the place turned out, to pay homage to this first Bishop of California. At eleven o'clock the vessel anchored. He came on shore, and was welcomed by the kneeling multitude. All received his benediction--all kissed the pontifical ring. The troops, and civic authorities, then escorted him to the house of Don José Antonio, where he dined. A carriage had been prepared for his Excellency, which was accompanied by several others occupied by the President and his friends. The females had formed, with ornamental canes, beautiful arches, through which the procession passed; and as it marched along, the heavy artillery of the "Presidio" continued to thunder forth its noisy welcome.[1]

The warmth of this welcome stands in sad contrast to the vacillating cycle of hope and heartbreak which characterized the tenure of Francisco García Diego as the first Bishop of the Californias. He had come encouraged by the ideological and financial support which Anastasio Bustamante, the Mexican president and his personal friend, had sought to provide. But Bustamante's fall from power in 1842 robbed the prelate and the infant diocese of such support. The confiscation of the Pious Fund left the new bishop with only meager resources.[2] This financial strain occasioned much hostility toward the Church and the person of the bishop throughout his administration. There is ample testimony to the strained relations which developed between García Diego and the people of Santa Barbara.[3] One incident, reported by an eyewitness with much collateral testimony, is sadly descriptive of this state of affairs. It seems the bishop was riding in his carriage when a bull which had been excited by a crowd charged the carriage, killing the mule and apparently causing physical injury to the prelate. It is not known whether the crowd acted deliberately, but it is certain that not one person came to the aid of the bishop, who was forced to make his own way back to the mission on foot.[4] The juxtaposition of this event with the prelate's triumphal arrival creates a powerful image of the dashed hopes of García Diego's episcopacy. In spite of such hardships, García Diego made commendable attempts at shepherding the new diocese through the economic, political, and cultural chaos of the last years of Mexican sovereignty in Upper California.

José González Rubio, by dint of his office as secretary to the bishop, found himself at the very center of Roman Catholic affairs in Upper California between 1842 and 1846. In March of 1842, the friar left his mission at San José and journeyed to Santa Barbara to join the episcopal household. In accepting the bishop's invitation,

González Rubio exercised the option which his superiors had given him and resigned from his offices as president and vice commissary-prefect of the Zacatecan missions, stating that he felt these offices to be incompatible with his position as the bishop's secretary.[5] The first of Bishop García Diego's letters to be written in the hand of González Rubio was dated April 10, 1842.[6] From that date until the bishop's death in 1846 all official episcopal correspondence and records were written in the hand of González Rubio. It has been accurately noted that in reality González Rubio was the bishop's scribe.[7] Adding to this the fact he was the bishop's confessor and constant companion, it becomes clear that González Rubio was privy to the most subtle nuances of Roman Catholic affairs and administration during García Diego's episcopacy.

The uncertainty of Church-state relations and the shaky status of the missions continued into the four years of García Diego's administration. When the bishop had arrived at San Diego in December, 1841, he brought a decree, issued jointly by President Bustamante and the Mexican Congress, which restored the control of Church property to the Franciscans.[8] But this decree became a dead letter with Bustamante's fall from power in 1842.

The increasing Anglo-American interest in Upper California contributed another factor to the secularization question. When Manuel Micheltorena arrived as the new governor of California in 1842, he brought with him a contingent of Mexican soldiers.[9] The Governor had proceeded only as far as the Pueblo of Los Angeles when he was informed of the seizure of Monterey by American naval forces. It seems that in September of 1842, the commander of the American Pacific Squadron, Commodore Thomas ap Catesby Jones, was falsely informed that Mexico and the United States were at war. In order to prevent California from

being ceded to Great Britain by Mexico, Jones immediately set sail for Monterey to validate the claim of the United States upon the territory. After the squadron arrived at Monterey on October 18, 1842, Commodore Jones demanded a peaceful surrender which he received on October 20. He then raised the American flag and declared that California was under the armed but benevolent occupation of the United States. On the following day, October 21, 1842, Jones finally went ashore and learned that he had been misinformed. He quickly sent his apologies to Governor Micheltorena at Los Angeles.[10] This incident helped to shape the tone of Micheltorena's administration. The Governor embraced the task of preserving California for Mexico in the face of growing threats from a foreign power.

On March 29, 1843, Micheltorena issued a decree neutralizing much of the secularization process.[11] Twelve of the missions were to be returned to the friars with the stipulation that one-eighth of the mission income be paid as a tax for the support of the military. The Governor sought the advice of Franciscan leaders before publication of the decree, and González Rubio communicated his assent to the legislation.[12] On April 18, 1843, Father Narciso Durán sent a letter to the missionaries under his jurisdiction urging them to comply with the decree, quoting its five articles, and adding some suggestions as to how they might be observed in a suitable manner.[13] González Rubio, writing to the Governor on June 10, 1843, informed him that he had sent letters to all the Justices of the Peace in the area of the northern missions communicating the cooperation of the Zacatecan friars. He told Micheltorena that he wanted the new legislation to result in the best possible remedy for the plight of the Indians, and that he would work to obviate any problems which might arise from mismanagement on the part of the missionaries. He promised total co-operation.[14] But the primary motiva-

tion for this decree, income for the military, did not allow the situation to endure. In the following summer, on August 24, 1844, the Governor and the Departmental Assembly issued an order resuming the secularization process, stipulating that the resultant income would be used for the maintenance of the military.[15]

Final legislative action for the secularization of the missions of Upper California was taken in 1845. On May 5 of that year the Departmental Assembly issued a decree empowering the governor, Pío Pico, to preside over the final sales of the missions; and, on October 28, 1845, Pico issued the executive order putting this process into operation.[16] No direct reply of González Rubio to this decree was available to this author. But it may be inferred that he shared the anguish which his bishop communicated to the Governor in a letter dated July 4, 1845.[17] García Diego poured out the fullness of his disappointment, despair, and frustration at what he considered to be the final signs of the inevitable demise of the Catholic Church in Upper California. The bishop's desperate words were recorded by the pen of his secretary, José González Rubio.

Another event in which González Rubio was intimately involved during his years as secretary to the bishop was the founding of the first seminary in the Californias. In article seven of the decree erecting the Diocese of Both Californias, Pope Gregory XVI suggested the establishment of a seminary, and the optimistic new prelate, still believing in the financial support which had been promised by the Mexican government, put a high priority on such an establishment. In spite of financial reverses, García Diego persevered in this project. In March, 1842, barely two months after his arrival at Santa Barbara, the bishop established the first seminary of the Californias "off the corridors of the old mission, in the rear apartments which had doors and windows on the patio side."[18] He appointed

Father Francisco Sánchez, a Mexican Franciscan who had come to California with him, as the first rector. On June 29, 1842, Miguel Gómez, after completing studies which he had begun in Mexico, was the first priest ordained in the Diocese of Both Californias.[19]

Two years later, in March of 1844, plans for the removal of this proto-seminary to larger quarters were concretized. On March 16, 1844, Governor Micheltorena was formally petitioned for a grant of land to provide income for the proposed seminary.[20] In May, 1844, the Governor granted the bishop six square leagues of land and augmented the gift with two additional leagues in September of 1844. "The Cañada de los Pinos, popularly known as the College Ranch, now embraced 35,499 acres of land, and thus the new seminary had assured means of its maintenance."[21] In addition, the Governor personally contributed five hundred pesos to the project. The bishop responded with gratitude, telling Micheltorena that such funds would be used to educate poor students who could not afford the 150 pesos per year in tuition, room, and board.[22] On the same day, March 27, 1844, Fathers José Joaquín Jimeno, Francisco Sánchez, and Juan Moreno, after thanking the Governor, urged him to pledge 500 pesos as an annual donation, so that primary education could also be undertaken at the seminary.[23] The Governor, in a gesture of laudable magnanimity, answered in the affirmative. His one stipulation was "that there should be admitted therein, under rules that may be adopted, every inhabitant of the Department, who having been instructed in the rudiments, desires to advance in higher studies."[24]

The new seminary, which was located at Mission Santa Inés, was officially established on May 4, 1844. On that day, Bishop García Diego celebrated a pontifical Mass in the mission church to solemnize the foundation. José Joaquín Jimeno was appointed rector, with Francisco Sánchez acting in the capacity of vice rector. Juan Moreno

was designated professor of letters, and Antonio Jimeno and Miguel Gómez were priests in residence. The student body consisted of Doroteo Ambris, Alejo Salmon, Agapito Cabrera, and Ramon González. A certain Diego Villa was also mentioned, but his status was unspecified.[25]

The official title of the seminary as it appeared at the beginning of its constitutions, written in the hand of González Rubio, was the Colegio Seminario de Maria Santísima de Guadalupe de Santa Inés de California.[26] The institution pledged itself to admit as many poor students as its resources would permit. Preference was to be given to orphans and sons of poor, but respectable, families. The sons of wealthier families were asked to pay 150 pesos per year for tuition, room, and board.[27] In paragraphs forty-three and forty-four of article nine of the constitutions, Indian boys were explicitly allowed and encouraged, by means of financial aid, to attend the seminary.[28]

Eighteen months after the foundation of the seminary, in December of 1845, José Joaquín Jimeno, the rector, reported to the bishop that the student body had grown to thirty-five students. However, only a few of these were studying for the priesthood. On January 1, 1846, Bishop García Diego ordained Doroteo Ambris, Prudencio Santillán, and José de los Santos as priests. In the chaotic years after 1846, enrollment steadily declined.[29]

On August 23, 1842, Bishop García Diego announced his resolve to embark upon a pastoral visitation of the new diocese. "It was his hope to confer the Sacrament of Confirmation and 'personally investigate' the status of Divine Worship, adopting all measures necessary to strengthen and increase the practice of the Faith."[30] José González Rubio accompanied the bishop on all the episcopal visitations from 1842 to 1844. In September of 1842 the episcopal party began the journey northward. The initial stop was at Mission Santa Inés, where the bishop confirmed

145 persons. Here the journey was halted due to unusually early and heavy rains.[31] In the following spring, during March and April of 1843, García Diego, accompanied by González Rubio, traveled south from Santa Barbara, visiting the missions of San Gabriel, San Fernando, and San Buenaventura, where 182 persons were confirmed.[32]

In May of 1844, González Rubio again traveled northward as a member of the episcopal party. The journey included stops at Mission Santa Inés (where the new seminary was dedicated on May 5 and twenty-seven persons were confirmed the following day) Mission La Purísima (where García Diego confirmed twenty-two more persons) Mission San Luis Obispo, and Mission San Antonio. On May 26, 1844, the party arrived in Monterey, where the bishop confirmed 294 persons. In June and July, 1844, García Diego confirmed 106 persons at Mission Santa Cruz, visited Mission San Juan Bautista, confirmed 170 persons at Mission Santa Clara, 120 at Mission San José, and 180 in the church at the Pueblo of San José. On July 16, 1844, the party reached Mission Dolores, near the Presidio of San Francisco. They did not venture farther north, to Missions San Rafael and San Francisco Solano, because Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo had made it clear that the bishop was not welcome. On the return trip the bishop confirmed eighty persons at Mission San Luis Obispo, and five more at Mission Santa Inés. Back in Santa Barbara, the visitation was officially completed on August 10, 1844.[33]

These journeys contributed much to González Rubio's knowledge of the condition of the population and the state of religion throughout Upper California. The friar's own administration of the Zacatecan missions had given him experience and knowledge of the northern portion of the Department. Residence in Santa Barbara, his duties as the bishop's secretary, and his participation in the episcopal visitations of 1842-1844 served to broaden his experience

of the diocese. In March of 1844, González Rubio was asked to prepare a report on the condition of the missions of the College of San Fernando. This he did, thereby familiarizing himself even more with conditions at the missions from San Miguel to San Diego.[34]

Because García Diego's health was diminishing noticeably in the early months of 1846, the prelate decided to take precautions to conserve the episcopal power in the case of his death. On April 19, 1846, the bishop officially appointed Fathers Narciso Durán and José González Rubio as his vicars-general. They were given the office both individually and jointly.[35] On the following day, Durán and González Rubio issued a letter announcing their appointment to all the Franciscan friars of Upper California and to the Dominican missionaries of Lower California, since both territories were included in the diocese.[36] In the next few days González Rubio directed two letters to Governor Pío Pico, one congratulating him on his appointment to the governorship, the other informing him of the office which he himself and Durán had been granted.[37] On April 30, 1846, Bishop Francisco García Diego y Moreno died "probably from tuberculosis aggravated by acute depression," leaving the diocese in the hands of Durán and González Rubio.[38]

On May 20, 1846, Governor Pico sent an official note to the two friars asking them to participate in a citizens assembly which was to meet in Santa Barbara the following month. González Rubio replied politely but cogently that he was distressed by the civil disorder and confusion in California, but that he and Father Durán wished to abide by the earlier Church-state understanding and to remain free of political involvement which would usurp the time they must devote to their priestly ministry.[39] In the same letter, González Rubio mentioned that Durán was sick and had taken to his bed. Eight days later, at five o'clock in the afternoon on June 1, 1846, Durán also succumbed,

XUM

leaving González Rubio as the sole administrator of the struggling diocese. The friar's realization of both loneliness and responsibility must have been overwhelming. González Rubio communicated his grief and uncertainty in a letter to Pío Pico. The friar stated that the sight of the infant Church of the Californias being robbed of its two principal pillars in only a few days made his grief much more bitter. And he wondered how he would bear the burden of administering the mitre without the companionship, experience, and direction of the deceased bishop.[40]

The position in which José González Rubio found himself in the summer of 1846 was not an enviable one. The Mexican regime in California was on the verge of collapse. In June of 1846, the last of the California missions were being sold, signaling the demise of the project to which González Rubio had devoted his life. On July 7, 1846, Commodore John D. Sloat would declare California to be subject to the United States. The bishop's treasury which González Rubio inherited to administer the diocese consisted of $97.00 in cash, plus $879.02 which was owed to the bishop.[41] In the midst of this political, cultural, and religious turmoil, on the eve of the American occupation of California, José González Rubio shouldered the burden of being the administrator of the sacred mitre of both Californias.

NOTES

CHAPTER IV

[1]Alfred Robinson, Life in California, p. 136.

[2]For a study of the Pious Fund litigation cf. John T. Doyle, The Case of the Pious Fund of California in the International Arbitral Court (San Francisco: G. Spaulding and Co., 1906). Doyle was chief counsel for the Catholic Church in this matter for forty-five years.

[3]Cf. Maynard Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara 1782-1965 (Santa Barbara: Santa Barbara Mission, 1965), pp. 128-131. Weber, García Diego, pp. 48-49.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Bancroft, History of California, IV, 372. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 296.

[6]García Diego to Alvarado, Mission Santa Barbara, April 10, 1842, AASF.

[7]Maynard Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 31.

[8]Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 330. Geary, The Secularization of the California Missions, p. 176.

[9]Hansen, The Search for Authority, pp. 36-37.

[10]Bean, California, pp. 91-92.

[11]Micheltorena, Decreto por el cual devuelve la administración de las Misiones a los frailes, 29 de Marzo, 1843. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 369. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 272-277. Geary, op. cit., pp. 182-183. Hittell, History of California, II, 323.

[12]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 273.

[13]Durán, Circular, Mission Santa Barbara, April 18, 1843. This document includes the "Reglamento para la Mejor Observancia de los cinco articulos." cf. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 371. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 277 ff..

[14]González Rubio to Micheltorena, Mission Santa Barbara, June 10, 1843, AASF.

[15]Cf. Bancroft, IV, 424. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 286 ff.. Hittell, op. cit., II, 339.

[16]Pico, Reglamento para la enagenación y arriendo de las Ex-Misiones, 28 de Oct., 1845. Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 549, 552. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 373, 445-450. Geary, op. cit., p. 188. Hansen, op. cit., pp. 49-50. Hittell, op. cit., II, 379-383.

[17]García Diego to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, July 4, 1845, BL.

[18]William E. North, Catholic Education in Southern California (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1936), p. 80.

[19]Ibid., p. 83.

[20]Ibid., p. 84.

[21]Ibid., p. 86.

[22]García Diego to Micheltorena, Mission Santa Barbara, March 27, 1844, AASF.

[23]Jimeno, Sánchez, Moreno to Micheltorena, Santa Inés, March 27, 1844, AASF.

[24]Zephyrin Engelhardt, Mission Santa Inés (Santa Barbara: 1932), p. 51.

[25]Bancroft, op. cit., IV, 426. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 225 ff..Mission Santa Inés, p. 55. North, op. cit., p. 87. Weber, op. cit., p.44.

[26]Santa Inés, May 5, 1844, SBMA. For a full translation of these constitutions cf. North, op. cit., Appendix II, pp. 201-211.

[27]North, op. cit., p. 90.

[28]Ibid., p. 207.

[29]Engelhardt, Mission Santa Inés, p. 56. North, op. cit., p. 93.

[30]Weber, op. cit., p. 40.

[31]Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 258.

[32]Ibid., IV, 259.

XUM

[33]Ibid., IV, 259-267.

[34]Santa Barbara, March 18, 1844, SBMA.

[35]Santa Barbara, April 19, 1846, SBMA. Bancroft, op. cit., V, 565. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 514-515.

[36]Durán and González Rubio, Circular, Mission Santa Barbara, April 20, 1846, AASF.

[37]González Rubio to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, April 22, 1846, AASF. González Rubio to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, April 25, 1846, AASF.

[38]Weber, op. cit., p. 49.

[39]González Rubio to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, May 24, 1846, AASF.

[40]González Rubio to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, June 1, 1846, AASF.

[41]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 519.

CHAPTER V

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MITRE (1846-1850)

The task of administering the Catholic Church of the Californias in the troubled times between 1846 and 1850 was an awesome one. Initially, José González Rubio's authority to do so was centered in the office of vicar general which the dying Bishop García Diego had committed to him in April of 1846. In the following year, this authority was officially recognized by the Catholic hierarchy in Mexico City when the metropolitan chapter elected him vicar capitular and governor of the sacred mitre of both Californias on October 7, 1847.[1] On April 29, 1848, Father Angel Martínez, guardian of the College of Guadalupe, wrote to González Rubio from Zacatecas that he had communicated his assent to the appointment to the dean of the metropolitan chapter and he strongly urged the friar to accept the office out of zeal for the glory of God and the well-being of the faithful, in order to uphold divine worship, morals, and the hope of further conversions among the Indians.[2] On July 20, 1848, González Rubio officially accepted the new offices and communicated the fact to his friar colleagues in California.[3]

Two more offices were bestowed upon González Rubio in the years before the hierarchy was officially re-established in California in 1850, one coming from California's neighbor to the north, Oregon, and the other coming again from Mexico. On September 12, 1848, Archbishop Francis Norbert Blanchet of Oregon constituted González Rubio his vicar general with responsibility for the many Oregon Catholics who were flocking to California in the Gold Rush.[4] Two days later, the archbishop informed the friar that he was sending a priest, Father John Baptist Brouillet, to

aid in this task and that the practical administration of the office would devolve upon him.[5]

By May of 1850, Church officials in Mexico had become aware of American Catholic arrangements to have a bishop appointed for the diocese of both Californias. Despairing of the hope of maintaining Mexican Catholic authority in Upper California, Mexico petitioned for an episcopal appointee for Lower California. On May 14, 1850, Father Antonio Castillo, the guardian of the College of Guadalupe, wrote to González Rubio informing him that he had been nominated for the post of vicar apostolic of Lower California with the office of bishop.[6] González Rubio replied, on July 23, 1850, that his authority as governor of the mitre was enough to guarantee the proper diocesan jurisdiction over Lower California. He gave his blessing and official assurance of valid faculties to six friars from the College of Guadalupe who were going as missionaries to Lower California, but he did not accept the proferred episcopate.[7]

The most basic change in the California situation with which González Rubio had to deal as administrator of the Catholic Church was the commencement of hostilities between the United States and Mexico and the American occupation of California.[8] On July 23, 1846, Commodore John D. Sloat, who had declared the United States to be in possession of California on July 7, 1846, relinquished his command to Commodore Robert F. Stockton. Stockton, a more martial spirit than his predecessor, stepped up the pace of the American takeover of California by increasing the military pressure and imposing tighter restrictions on the native Californian populace. On August 17, 1846, Stockton issued an edict to the people in which he imposed martial law. Citizens were forbidden to bear arms without special permission and a curfew was imposed from 10 P. M. to sunrise. Everyone was asked to take an oath of allegiance to the new regime or leave the territory. Local elections

were to be held to replace magistrates who chose to leave, with the stipulation that failure to do so would lead to American appointees being selected for these positions. In civil matters, the law of the land was to prevail until American legal procedures could be regularized.[9]

Military action continued through the fall of 1846, and the final surrender of the Californian and Mexican forces came on January 13, 1847, with the signing of the Capitulation of Cahuenga.[10] Until 1849, California was administered by American military governors. In September of that year, a convention met to draft the constitution for the proposed new state. On November 13, 1849, the constitution was ratified and the first state officials were elected. On September 9, 1850, President Millard Fillmore signed the bill admitting California into the Union.[11]

No direct response of González Rubio to Stockton's edict of August 17, 1846, is to be found. His colleague, José Joaquín Jimeno, did issue a circular letter which summed up the Franciscan position regarding the American occupation of August 28, 1846.[12] The friars were charged to conduct themselves with "piety, prudence, tact, and politeness," keeping the laws of the Church, but not flaunting them, so that religion would not be endangered. They were to avoid arguments about religion, to constantly show good example, and to obey all laws which were not contrary to religion or morals. Finally, the friars were given permission to take the oath of allegiance to American authority, since this could involve only passive submission which promised not to engage in subversive activity to overthrow or disturb the new order of government.

In 1847 and 1848, the American military governors and other American officials sought to maintain the status quo with regard to the disposition of Church property until proper legal channels were operative. Stephen W. Kearny

acting as military governor, on March 22, 1847, ruled that Missions San José, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz were to remain in the possession of Catholic priests as they had been when the American flag was raised in the previous year.[13] After the death of Father Tomás Estenega at San Gabriel Mission early in 1847, Colonel J. D. Stevenson, American commandant of the Southern district, declared that the mission property was to remain in the hands of the duly-appointed Mexican administrator until title could be legally cleared.[14] In June of 1847, Governor Richard B. Mason ordered the alcalde of San José to evict the poachers who were occupying the mission buildings at San José and Santa Clara, stating that enough time had passed since the publication of Kearny's original order regarding the matter.[15] And in August of 1848, Secretary of State H. W. Halleck sent a letter to Father González Rubio with an inventory of the goods at Mission San Diego, urging the friar to claim them before looters carried them away.[16]

One of the most delicate problems which José González Rubio faced as governor of the mitre during the American occupation was the status of Roman Catholic laws regarding the Sacrament of Matrimony. Under Mexican and Catholic law only those marriages contracted between two baptized Catholics in the presence of a priest were recognized as sacramentally valid in the Church. Mixed marriages, those between a Catholic and a person of another religion, were forbidden, except in the case of a special dispensation. The arrival of non-Catholics in California led to serious problems in this regard. On January 9, 1846, Bishop García Diego had issued a scathing denunciation of irregularities in the application of the marriage law in California to Governor Pío Pico.[17] The prelate railed at reports that John Sutter, at Sacramento, and British vice consul Alexander Forbes were publicly performing civil marriages between Protestants and mixed

marriages between Protestants and Catholics, and that participants in the affairs were going so far as to ridicule the Mexican Constitution and the Catholic priesthood. He asked the Governor to stop civil magistrates from officiating at marriages which involved any Catholics, and to insure that Protestant wedding ceremonies be held privately so as not to flaunt the law of the land and scandalize Catholic citizens. When the American occupation commenced in July of 1846, it fell to González Rubio to cope with the further implications of the new religious pluralism for the status of Catholic marriage in California.

On July 31, 1847, González Rubio directed a letter to Governor Richard B. Mason requesting him to forbid the practice of civil magistrates officiating at marriages in which Catholics were involved.[18] Mason, acting to uphold Mexican and Catholic law and custom until American legal procedures were officially introduced, agreed to the request and issued the order stating the stipulations to alcaldes and other civil authorities on August 23, 1847.[19] Early in September, 1847, González Rubio circulated Mason's letter to the priests of California and added his own admonition regarding the Catholic teaching on marriage. The friar spoke of the Protestant view of marriage in which the relationship was regarded neither as a sacrament nor as indissoluble. In light of this natural, non-sacramental interpretation of marriage, Protestants could logically undertake the relationship with the approbation of only secular, civil authority. But Catholics who would seek to be married only with civil permission would be in violation of the traditional Catholic view of marriage as a supernatural institution with the status of a sacrament. The friar cited passages from the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the early Church Fathers to substantiate the origins of the Catholic marriage doctrine and continued, in some of the most beautiful lines in all his corre-

XUM

spondence, to praise the beauty and significance of the married state. Finally, González Rubio issued warnings against the dangers of mixed marriages and urged his fellow priests to work hard to uphold the dignity and integrity of Catholic marriage in their ministry.[20]

With the inundation of California by non-Catholics in the Gold Rush, the agreement which González Rubio had negotiated regarding Catholic marriage became more and more tenuous. In July of 1849, the delicate balance was upset when a Protestant army officer married a Catholic woman at Monterey, with a Protestant minister officiating. To complicate matters, a Dominican priest, newly arrived from Lower California, gave his blessing to the marriage. Subsequently, González Rubio was petitioned for dispensations to rectify the situation.[21] The most significant outcome of the affair was that, on July 23, 1849, González Rubio appealed to Governor Bennett Riley for the extension and application of Mason's agreement to protect Catholic marriage laws in California. The reply came from Secretary of State H. W. Halleck, on August 13, 1849, that the new governor had no power to enforce or renew the Mason order, nor did he desire to do so since the original order had been a temporary wartime provision and its further enforcement would run directly counter to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States.[23]

In the fall of 1849, the question was finally and legally settled with the adoption of the constitution for the proposed new state of California. Section twelve of article eleven of that document stated that "no contract of marriage, if otherwise duly made, shall be invalidated for want of conformity to the requirements of any religious sect." This provision led González Rubio to compose a lengthy letter which he directed to all the priests of California on December 28, 1849.[24] The Franciscan administrator began by insisting that the Catholic Church

did not belong to the general category of religious sects, which were human inventions, because of its divine origin and foundation by Jesus Christ. The Church was placed in this category only in the eyes of civil law. For Catholics, the validity and licitness of the marriage contract was still dependent on ecclesiastical, not civil, law. And unless the Church's criteria were met, no civil law could render a marriage sacramentally valid and binding, for civil law could not replace legitimate Catholic authority. The friar warned his fellow priests to discourage mixed marriages, completely if possible. Otherwise, they were to carefully seek the proper dispensations and to refrain from validating marriages involving Catholics performed by Protestant ministers and Justices of the Peace without proper investigation and recourse to higher Church authority. In regard to dispensations for mixed marriages, González Rubio referred to the Councils of Baltimore in which American bishops had given the power of granting dispensations to the pastors of parishes, with the proviso that it be exercised only if the Catholic who wished to be married seemed in danger of contracting an illegal marriage outside the Church.[25] The friar went on to say that the Catholic Church in California still was not under the jurisdiction of the American hierarchy, although the same situation of religious pluralism did exist. He held, therefore, that any dispensations for mixed marriages in California must come from Rome; but, while he, as administrator of the diocese, awaited this authority to be delegated to him, he would assume the permission since difficult and urgent marriage cases were bound to arise.[26]

This letter demonstrated González Rubio's tactful leadership of the Church through a time of uncertain religious and cultural ferment. He was a dedicated churchman, committed to defending the integrity of the diocese and Catholic polity with a commendable command of canon law,

XUM

theology, and Church history, who at the same time, was aware of the necessity of easing the Church into the new pluralistic society in California with as much diplomacy as possible. An example of González Rubio's willingness to engage in this latter task occurred in the fall of 1849 when the friar, answering a request from Governor Bennett Riley, directed the priests of California to invite their flocks to attend Mass on Thursday, November 29, 1849, where they were to sing a Te Deum and offer public prayers of gratitude to God. In this way, the Catholic population was encouraged to celebrate the first Thanksgiving holiday to take place in California.[27]

The full weight of responsibility which González Rubio felt for the preservation of Catholic Christianity in California in these years of ferment came to expression in the pastoral letters which he addressed to the clergy and faithful as vicar capitular and administrator of the mitre. The first of these letters, giving a general summary of the sad state of the Church, was dated May 30, 1848.[28] The friar lamented that

> day by day we see our circumstances grow in difficulty; that the hope of supplying the needed clergy is now almost extinguished; and, worst of all, that through lack of means and priests, divine worship throughout the whole diocese stands on the brink of total ruin.[29]

González Rubio went on to speculate on the harm which would result to the Catholic faithful in light of such circumstances in these words:

> What will be their lot? I indeed know not; nevertheless we most assuredly hold that if among the inhabitants of this State religious ignorance increases, if charity grows cold and faith weakens a little more, such persons will, at the first attack, plunge into spiritual darkness, either in the form of infidelity, or Protestantism, or religious indifference and complete forgetfulness of God.[30]

XUM

The letter ended with an exhortation to prayer, sincere repentance, and deeper devotion to the Virgin Mary, who was the principal patroness of the diocese under the title of Our Lady of Refuge. In addition, the friar offered a plenary indulgence to those who would receive the sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist with contrite hearts.

On July 14, 1848, González Rubio penned another pastoral letter to the clergy and faithful of California.[31] His primary theme was an exhortation to the Catholics of the diocese to heed the universal Church law of tithing, that is of contributing ten percent of one's income to the support of the Church. The friar, considering the tithe a weighty obligation, pointed out that even many of the wealthiest constituents of the diocese had failed, partially or completely, in this matter. This letter indicated one very difficult aspect of the Church's transition into a pluralistic society. Because of the missionary organization of Catholicism in Hispanic California, as well as the traditional union of Church and state in Hispanic Catholicism, the Catholics of California had never felt the personal obligation to financially support their Church. The ministry of religion had been available to them without such financial demands. González Rubio's task was to foment a change in the religious and cultural consciousness of his flock in this regard.

Early in the following summer, on June 13, 1849, González Rubio again set pen to paper in the hope of convincing the Catholic faithful of California to come to the financial aid of their Church.[32] The administrator's concern had come to dwell more specifically on the task of recruiting well educated, dedicated priests for the diocese. He had come to realize that neither California itself nor Mexico were capable of providing a sufficient number of priests who could work well in the new society which the American annexation and the Gold Rush were

creating in California. In this letter he speculated on the problem and a possible solution:

> Whence, therefore, shall we provide ourselves with properly instructed priests, zealous men, and in numbers proportioned to the actual needs of the country? From Europe alone. In Europe there are plenty of priests who are ready to come. But where are the funds, where are the revenues to allow us to bring them? Here in California, the Church is entirely destitute of means; for even the sources of revenue which it formerly possessed in the Mission system that obtained here, and the aid derived from the Pious Fund and such like have all disappeared.[33]

After describing his attempts at recruiting priests, González Rubio ended the letter by pointing out the alternatives should the faithful fail to respond to his pleas for financial support in this task.

> It is enough that we have shown you that the Religion of Jesus Christ cannot, without your co-operation and sacrifices, exist longer in this country; that divine worship without priests and sufficient income, can no longer continue; that the administration of the sacraments, the education and training of youth, and lastly, the conversion of the Indians, cannot be brought about without evangelical laborers who consecrate their talents, their labors, and even their very lives to these noble purposes.[34]

During his tenure as administrator of the mitre, González Rubio worked assiduously at the task of recruiting priests. The best accounts available reveal that fifteen priests were functioning in all of Upper California when González Rubio assumed office in 1846.[35] In 1847 and 1848, two priests died, and the need for priests grew as the population began to increase under the influence of American annexation and the Gold Rush.[36] The first place to which González Rubio appealed in this regard was to the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, in the person of Louis Maigret, the bishop-elect of the Sandwich Islands who resided in Honolulu. González Rubio must have

written to Maigret early in 1847 requesting the bishop-elect to send him a new supply of the holy oils used in the celebration of certain Catholic sacraments.[37] On May 1, 1847, Maigret informed González Rubio of his consecration to the episcopate which was to take place at Valparaiso, Chile, and promised to send the friar a quantity of holy oils as soon as possible.[38]

In the following year, on March 26, 1848, González Rubio directed another letter to Maigret, this time requesting that the bishop-elect ordain two clerics from the seminary at Santa Inés to the priesthood. The administrator also petitioned Maigret for two or three priests from his own congregation, popularly known as the Picpus Fathers, to come and work to alleviate the increasing need for priests in California.[39] In July of 1848, Maigret responded that he would gladly ordain any candidates for the priesthood who had received González Rubio's approval, but that he could not spare the priests which the friar had requested due to the heavy demands in Hawaii.[40] But, in October of 1848, the bishop-elect sent another letter to González Rubio, this time informing him that the situation in Hawaii had changed and that he was sending two Picpus priests to aid him.[41] These priests, John Chrysostom Holbein and Stanislaus Lebret, arrived in California in December, 1848, and were given faculties for the diocese by González Rubio on January 23, 1849. Holbein was assigned to San Diego and Lebret to Los Angeles. Another priest, Father Sebastian Bongiami, whose place of origin is unknown, arrived in California in the fall of 1848. Apparently his credentials were in order and González Rubio gave him faculties to minister in the diocese on October 23, 1848.[42]

Undoubtedly heartened by the positive response which he had received from the Picpus Fathers, González Rubio sent further appeals to the congregation in the

person of their superior, Archbishop J. D. Bonamie, who resided at the Picpus headquarters in Paris. Early in February, 1849, the administrator wrote to Bonamie expressing his gratitude for the services of Fathers Lebret and Holbein, and asking for more priests who could speak both English and Spanish. He informed the archbishop of the growing confusion and the increasing threat from Protestantism in California which only good priests could remedy. This reflected the invasion of California by gold seekers from all over the world in late 1848 and 1849. González Rubio included a check for $2,000.00 in the letter which he wished the archbishop to use to defray the transportation expenses for any priests who might be spared to ministry in California.[43]

On August 11, 1849, Bonamie wrote González Rubio that he had transmitted the sad news of Catholic affairs in California to the Pope who was engaging himself in providing a bishop for the orphaned diocese.[44] He informed González Rubio that he was sending some members of his congregation who might aid in staffing the seminary at Santa Inés, and went on to intimate that Father Lebret had written that, in such a case, title to the seminary might possibly be transferred to the Picpus congregation. Bonamie closed with a note of gratitude for González Rubio's thoughtfulness in sending money for travel expenses.[45] In February, 1850, González Rubio responded that he was very grateful for the archbishop's help and sent another one thousand dollars for travel costs. At the same time, he dispelled the rumor which Archbishop Bonamie reported concerning the possibility of the Picpus congregation being given title to the seminary property at Mission Santa Inés.[46] To this the archbishop responded that he wanted no jurisdiction over the seminary property, only its use and produce to support any members of his congregation who might be stationed there. He also informed González Rubio that

the Pope was nearing his decision concerning an appointee for the episcopate in California.[47]

In March of 1850, three more priests of the Picpus congregation, John Gaspar du Monteil, Theodosius Bossier, and Felix Migorel, arrived in California. On May 7 of the same year, the latter two priests were assigned to replace Fathers José Joaquín Jimeno and Francisco Sánchez at the Santa Inés Seminary.[48] González Rubio wrote to Jimeno and Sánchez on the same day thanking them for all their work in founding and preserving the faith in California and lamenting his inability to provide them with a reward capable of expressing his personal gratitude.[49] In August of 1850, González Rubio received word from the Picpus Bishop Anthony Doumer of Valparaiso, Chile, that two more priests of the congregation were en route to California. In the same letter the bishop lamented the news he had received that González Rubio was apparently to be transferred to Lower California, which he referred to as the "Siberia of Mexico."[50] The two Picpus priests, Fathers Flavian Fontaine and Anaclet Lestrade, arrived in California late in September of 1850. This brought the total number of Picpus priests in California at the end of 1850 to seven.[51]

Another person to whom González Rubio applied in the hope of attracting priests to California was Archbishop Francis Norbert Blanchet of Oregon.[52] In August of 1848, González Rubio petitioned the archbishop for priests and a supply of holy oils. In the following month, Blanchet informed the administrator that both requests would be granted, but that his initial contribution would be limited to only one priest because of the needs of the Church in Oregon.[53] In November of 1848, Blanchet appointed Father John Brouillet as his personal representative to Catholics from Oregon, a great many of whom had come to California in the Gold Rush.[54] Brouillet arrived in December

of the same year and was awarded faculties by González Rubio on February 2, 1849.[55] In the winter of 1849, three more priests arrived in California from Oregon, Fathers Anthony Langlois, Paulino Romani, and Alexandro Branchi. All three were granted faculties on May 30, 1849, and González Rubio designated Father Langlois his vicar-forane for the northern portion of California.[56] Before the end of 1849, on December 8, two more priests, Fathers Michael Accolti and John Nobili, both Jesuits, arrived from Oregon to investigate the possibility of founding an educational institution in the state.[57] Also, on March 27, 1849, Father Ignatius Ramírez de Arellano, a Dominican, had arrived from Lower California.[58]

During 1849 and 1850, seven more priests came to labor in California from various places. They were José María Peñeiro, Francis Coyle, Peter Joseph Doubet, John Fahey, Peter Augustine Anderson, John Ingoldsby, and John Mary Delmas.[59] This brought the total number of priests to arrive in California under the auspices of González Rubio's administration to twenty-two. This number, when added to the thirteen priests who remained from the Mexican period, totaled a force of thirty-five Catholic priests engaged in active ministry at the end of 1850, when González Rubio surrendered his authority to the newly-arrived bishop of California. Certainly the need for priests exceeded the number available. Yet, it is to González Rubio's credit that he could assemble sufficient clergy to keep the Catholic Church in California alive and functioning in light of the overwhelming challenge offered by the cultural transition and population increase occasioned by the American annexation and the Gold Rush.

González Rubio left no personal diaries or letters to indicate his private perspective on the responsibility he bore or the cultural chaos he witnessed between 1846 and 1850. A lengthy letter which he sent to Father John

Brouillet contained his opinions on the status of former mission lands and Church property.[60] After reviewing the history of the California missions, he steadfastly held to the conclusion that mission lands had never belonged to anyone, neither the Church nor state, except the Indians. So, opined González Rubio, any claim which the Church might file to recover these lands under the new American government, could be made only to come to the aid of the remaining Mission Indians. It would be illegal and unjust for the Church to press such claims in her own name. The fact that a by-product of the expropriation of mission wealth was the undermining of support for the Catholic religion was an injustice for which the Church had no recourse, and which the Church must bear silently. In regard to property to which the Church had a rightful claim, for example, Church buildings, sacred vessels, parish houses, and cemeteries, González Rubio declared that he would trust the new United States government to legislate justly, and the friar reviewed the nature of the evidence which would legally substantiate the Church's claim. The letter communicated González Rubio's sadness over the great injustice done to the Indians, his frustration at being powerless to effect their equitable reimbursement, and his hope that the Church would find some justice and peace under the new American regime. It was a nostalgic sigh of both disappointment and relief as he allowed his mind to scan the turbulence and upheavel of the years since 1833 when he had arrived in California, and to ponder what would lie ahead in the new era.

Since González Rubio was a continuous resident of Santa Barbara from 1846 to 1850, it may be assumed that he witnessed some of the major episodes in the town during those years. Although the American flag was first raised in Santa Barbara in the summer of 1846, Mexican and Californian resistance near Los Angeles frightened

away the few American soldiers garrisoned there. On December 27, 1846, an American force of 428 men, commanded by John C. Frémont, occupied the town and, the next day, the Stars and Stripes were unfurled.[61] Frémont's battalion remained a week in Santa Barbara before moving on to Los Angeles on January 3, 1847. Three months later, on April 8, 1847, Captain Francis J. Lippett and Company F of the New York Volunteers arrived in the town to commence the official military occupation. During the period of Lippett's command, Colonel Richard B. Mason came to investigate rumors of popular discontent among the inhabitants of Santa Barbara. This he found to have been caused by bad conduct among certain American soldiers who were summarily tried by a general court martial.[62]

Such misrepresentations revealed that Lippett was generally distrustful of the populace of Santa Barbara. It was he who charged that they had stolen a cannon from the wreckage of an American ship, with the intent of using it to rebel against the American forces. A fine was levied on the inhabitants of the town, but when Colonel J. D. Stevenson arrived from Los Angeles to collect it, he found the people quite unwilling to pay. Following the advice of Pablo de la Guerra, one of the town's foremost citizens, the colonel decided to woo the populace with music and merriment provided by his military band. On the evening of July 3, 1848, and through the following day, the first official Fourth of July to be celebrated in Santa Barbara, the concert and conviviality continued. Music succeeded where diplomacy had failed, and most of the inhabitants of the town cheerfully contributed toward the payment of the fine.[63]

In 1850, near the end of González Rubio's tenure as governor of the mitre, a group of Santa Barbara citizens paid the friar a moving tribute by commissioning Lorenzo Barbieri to paint his portrait. The fund assembled for

the project finally totaled slightly less than $400.00. The list of donors ran to almost ninety names, many of whom were listed as representing their wives and families as well as themselves.[64] The painting, which still graces the walls of Santa Barbara Mission, depicts González Rubio at forty-six years of age, after seventeen years of work in the chaos of transitional California. The deep-set eyes and gentle mouth convey a sense of the friar's soft-spoken, yet intense, compassion for his flock, as well as the prayerful introspection which nourished his faith through so many crises. The inscription which the donors caused to be placed at the bottom of the portrait gave a clear statement of the esteem with which González Rubio was regarded. It read:

> The Most Illustrious Father José María de Jesús González Rubio of the Franciscan Order, governor of the sacred mitre of both Californias, which the people of Santa Barbara had painted in testimony to their keen affection and public acknowledgement, to be preserved as a precious memorial of his eminent virtues and a grateful memento of his unquenchable charity toward the poor and his love for all.[65]

Certainly the friar's heart must have been warmed by the public expression of these sentiments, and he must have felt the burden of his responsibility growing a bit lighter as the rumors regarding the appointment of a bishop for Upper California from the United States were validated near the end of 1850.

XUM

NOTES

CHAPTER V

[1]Metropolitan Chapter, Mexico City, October 7, 1847, SBMA. Reyes de Mendiola to González Rubio, Mexico City, October 7, 1847, SBMA. Bancroft, History of California, V, 566.

[2]Martínez to González Rubio, Zacatecas, April 29, 1848, SBMA.

[3]Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 521.

[4]Blanchet to González Rubio, Willamette, September 12, 1848, SBMA.

[5]Blanchet to González Rubio, Willamette, September 14, 1848, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 615.

[6]Castillo to González Rubio, Guadalajara, May 14, 1850, SBMA.

[7]González Rubio to Castillo, Mission Santa Barbara, July 23, 1850, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 664.

[8]For an interesting summary of American hierarchical correspondence regarding the state of the Catholic Church in California between 1846 and 1850 cf. John B. McGloin, California's First Archbishop (New York: Herder and Herder, 1966), pp. 68-75.

[9]Stockton, Los Angeles, August 17, 1846, SBMA.

[10]For a summary of the Mexican War in California cf. Bean, California, pp. 100-106.

[11]For a summary of California politics between 1846 and 1850 cf. Bean, op. cit., pp. 125-134. For a detailed account of the constitutional convention of 1849 cf. Hansen, The Search for Authority.

[12]Jimeno, Circular, Santa Inés, August 28, 1846, SBMA.

[13]Kearny, Monterey, March 22, 1847, AASF.

[14]Stevenson, Los Angeles, June 2, 1847, SBMA.

[15]Mason, Monterey, June 24, 1847, SBMA.

[16]Halleck to González Rubio, Monterey, August 18, 1848, SBMA.

XUM

[17]García Diego to Pico, Mission Santa Barbara, January 9, 1846, AASF.

[18]González Rubio to Mason, Mission Santa Barbara, July 31, 1847, SBMA.

[19]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 599-601.

[20]González Rubio, Circular, Mission Santa Barbara, September 4, 1847, AASF. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 602-603. Engelhardt gives the date of this circular letter as September 7, 1847, because the copy to which he referred, n. 55 in the Libro Borrador, bears that date.

[21]Ambris to González Rubio, Mission San Antonio, July 11, 1849, SBMA. The Dominican priest, Ignacio Ramírez de Arellano, was severely reprimanded by González Rubio in letters dated July 24, 1849, and September 10, 1849. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 604, note 29.

[22]González Rubio to Riley, Mission Santa Barbara, July 23, 1849, SBMA.

[23]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 604-605.

[24]González Rubio, Circular, December 28, 1849, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 660, note 21.

[25]This is the first mention of the internal affairs of the American Catholic Church in the correspondence of González Rubio which this author consulted. For the Councils of Baltimore cf. Peter Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore 1791-1884 (New York: MacMillan, 1932).

[26]In assuming this authority in extreme cases, González Rubio appealed to the principle of "epikeia" which, in Catholic moral theology, allows latitude in the interpretation of human laws for the sake of a higher supernatural end. cf. Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler, Theological Dictionary (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), p. 148.

[27]González Rubio to Halleck, Mission Santa Barbara, November 5, 1849, SBMA. González Rubio referred to the celebration of Thanksgiving Day as a "rational" and "pious" custom in a letter dated November 9, 1849. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 661-663.

[28]González Rubio, Pastoral, Mission Santa Barbara, May 30, 1848, AASF.

XUM

[29]This translation is from excerpts and a summary of the letter in Joseph W. Riordan, The First Half Century of St. Ignatius Church and College (San Francisco: H.S. Crocker Co., 1905), pp. 11-15. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 606-607.

[30]Riordan, op. cit., p. 12. By the end of 1849, six Protestant denominations, represented by twelve clergymen, were operative in the northern portion of California at San Francisco, Sacramento, San José, Benicia, and Monterey. These denominations and clergymen were: Baptist (Osgood Wheeler), Congregationalist (Timothy Dwight Hunt, Joseph A. Benton), Methodist Episcopal (William Taylor, Isaac Owen), Old School Presbyterian (Sylvester Woodridge, Jr., Albert Williams), New School Presbyterian (Samuel H. Willey, John W. Douglas), and Protestant Episcopal (Flavel S. Mines, J.L. Ver Mehr, Richard F. Burnham). cf. Clifford M. Drury, A Chronology of Protestant Beginnings in California (San Francisco: Centennial Committee Northern California-Western Nevada Council of Churches, 1947).

In Southern California, the advent of the Mormon Battalion during the Mexican War represented the first major influx of non-Catholics. This remarkable story, as well as the subsequent history of the Mormons in Southern California during the early American period, is related in Harland E. Hogue, "A History of Religion in Southern California: 1846-1880" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958), pp. 26-43.

[31]González Rubio, Pastoral, Mission Santa Barbara, July 14, 1848, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 608.

[32]González Rubio, Pastoral, Mission Santa Barbara, June 13, 1849, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 619-622. Riordan, op. cit., pp. 13-17.

[33]Riordan, op. cit., p. 15.

[34]Ibid., p. 17.

[35]This number was arrived at by consulting Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, Appendix II, pp. 282-293. North, Catholic Education, pp. 83, 93. Weber, García Diego, Appendix, p. 63. These priests were: Doroteo Ambris, José Antonio Anzar, Tomás Estenega, Miguel Gómez, José González Rubio, Antonio Jiménez del Recio, Antonio Jimeno, José Joaquín Jimeno, Vicente Oliva, Blas Ordaz, José María Rosales, Francisco Sánchez, Prudencio Santillán, José María Suárez del Real, and José María Zalvidea. In addition, Father Eugene McNamara, an Irish priest, arrived in the summer of 1846, hoping to set up an Irish Catholic colony in

California, but he left after only a few weeks. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 549. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 141.

[36]These priests were Tomás Estenega who died early in 1847 and Vicente Oliva who passed away on January 2, 1848. cf. Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, pp. 284, 289. For examples of requests for priests directed to González Rubio cf. Ayuntamiento of Los Angeles to González Rubio, Los Angeles, May 15, 1847, SBMA. People of Mission San Buenaventura to González Rubio, Mission San Buenaventura, October 12, 1848, SBMA.

[37]These holy oils or chrisms can be consecrated only by a bishop. It will be recalled that even though Gonzalez Rubio administered the Diocese of Both Californias he had not been elevated to the office of bishop. Hence, he had to have recourse to another bishop to secure the holy oils.

[38]Maigret to González Rubio, Honolulu, May 1, 1847, SBMA.

[39]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 612. For the larger story of the Picpus Congregation in California in this period cf. Harold A. Whelan, The Picpus Story: 1826-1856 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972).

[40]Maigret to González Rubio, Honolulu, July 9, 1848, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 613.

[41]Maigret to González Rubio, Honolulu, October 25, 1848, SBMA.

[42]Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[43]González Rubio to Bonamie, Mission Santa Barbara, February 1, 1849, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 622.

[44]Bonamie to González Rubio, Paris, August 11, 1849, SBMA.

[45]Cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 623.

[46]González Rubio to Bonamie, Mission Santa Barbara, February 13, 1850, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 624.

[47]Bonamie to González Rubio, Paris, May 13, 1850, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[48]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 625.

[49]González Rubio to Jimeno and Sánchez, Mission Santa Barbara, May 7, 1850, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[50]Doumer to González Rubio, Valparaiso, August 19, 1850, SBMA. cf. notes 6 and 7 above.

[51]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 627.

[52]For a treatment of Roman Catholic affairs in Oregon in this period and the work of Blanchet cf. Edwin V. O'Hara, Catholic History of Oregon (Portland: Catholic Book Co., 1916), and Sister Mary Letitia Lyons, Francis Norbert Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Missions (1838-1848) (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1940).

[53]Blanchet to González Rubio, Willamette, September 14, 1848, SBMA.

[54]Blanchet, Willamette, November 15, 1848, SBMA.

[55]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 615.

[56]Ibid., IV, 616.

[57]Accolti and Nobili to González Rubio, San Francisco, April 9, 1850, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 677-681. John B. McGloin, Jesuits by the Golden Gate: The Society of Jesus in San Francisco, 1849-1969 (San Francisco: University of San Francisco Press, 1972), pp. 1-6. Riordan, op. cit., pp. 25-28.

[58]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 616.

[59]For details regarding the places of origin and arrival dates of these priests cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 627-628.

[60]González Rubio to Brouillet, Mission Santa Barbara, June 23, 1849, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 734, note 24.

[61]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 142.

[62]Ibid., p. 143.

[63]The tale of the lost cannon is one of the favorite reminiscences of Santa Barbarans to this day. A final chapter was added to the episode ten years later, in 1858, when the cannon, useless because it lacked a carriage, was found buried in the sand of the Santa Barbara shoreline. cf. Bancroft, op. cit., V, 587. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, pp. 280-286. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 143-144.

XUM

[64]List of donors, Santa Barbara, September 25, 1850, SBMA.

[65]This translation appears in Maynard Geiger, "The Very Rev. José María de Jesús González Rubio, O.F.M. (1804-1875)," Provincial Annals, VIII:1 (January, 1946), 30.

CHAPTER VI

CATHOLIC AUTHORITY IN AMERICAN CALIFORNIA (1850-1856)

Shortly after the American possession of Upper California was officially ratified on February 2, 1848 by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, leaders of the American Catholic Church engaged in thought and discussion regarding the appointment of a bishop for the newly-acquired territory. Archbishop Samuel Eccleston of Baltimore, acting upon information received from American government and military sources in the winter and spring of 1848, informed Giacomo Fransoni, Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda Fide in Rome, of the dire state of Catholic affairs in California and asked for help in regularizing the situation.[1] Bishop John Hughes of New York sought and received an evaluation of the California Catholic situation from Jose de la Guerra, one of the most prominent of Santa Barbara's citizens, in the winter of 1848-1849 and urged that the appointment of one or more bishops for the area be discussed at the next council of the American Catholic bishops.[2] The topic of new episcopal appointees did appear on the agenda when the bishops convened at the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore in May of 1849.[3] On November 20, 1849, Pope Pius IX appointed Father Charles Pius Montgomery, a Dominican priest and a native of Kentucky, as the Bishop of the Diocese of Both Californias, newly constituted as the Diocese of Monterey in California. But the priest, pleading a lack of administrative talent and bad health, refused the appointment of February 22, 1850.[4]

XUM

After three more months of deliberation, the Pope decided upon the appointment of Father Joseph Alemany, also a Dominican, to the See of Monterey. In early June of 1850, the priest had arrived in Rome for what he thought would be routine business for his religious order. Instead, he was informed that he was destined for the episcopacy and, on June 16, 1850, the Pope himself resolutely refused to accept any excuses or attempts at resigning the position. On June 30, 1850, Cardinal Fransoni conferred the episcopal consecration and Joseph Sadoc Alemany became the first American bishop to hold jurisdiction in American California.[5] It was provisionally decreed that the diocese would be immediately subject to Rome, rather than to the American hierarchy, until problems of jurisdiction with Mexico could be settled.[6]

Joseph Sadoc Alemany, although only one month shy of thirty-six years of age at the time of his consecration as bishop in 1850, was a well-traveled priest with practical experience in Catholic affairs in both Europe and America. He was born in Vich, near Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, on July 13, 1814. After receiving his primary education, he entered the diocesan seminary at ten years of age. Alemany entered the Dominican Order in September, 1830, and, after completing his theological studies in Italy, he was ordained a priest on March 11, 1837 in the Cathedral of San Lorenzo in Viterbo, Italy. In 1839, the young Dominican, who had made known his desire to pursue the vocation of a missionary, was assigned to the United States. On April 2, 1840, after a rather uncomfortable voyage, Alemany arrived in New York City. He proceeded almost immediately to Ohio and he spent the next nine years as a missionary in Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky. In 1848, Alemany was appointed provincial of the Dominican Province of St. Joseph, which in effect rendered him the spiritual father of all the Dominicans in the United States. As a result of this office,

XUM

Alemany attended the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore, held in May of 1849, where he became familiar to many members of the American Catholic hierarchy. In the spring of 1850, the provincial left for Europe to attend the General Chapter of his order in Italy. The General Chapter was canceled, but the journey was nonetheless momentous for Alemany. In Rome the mitre of the Diocese of Monterey in California was conferred upon him on June 30, 1850.[7]

On July 30, 1850, the new bishop left Rome to begin the journey to his new home in California. After stopping in France, England, and Ireland to seek financial support and personnel for his diocese, he arrived in New York on October 12, 1850. Upon completing a short visit to Baltimore, Alemany took ship for California from New York on October 28, 1850. He arrived in San Francisco on December 6 of the same year. After remaining eight days in that city and enjoying a warm welcome from the Catholics there, the new bishop set out for Santa Barbara to present his credentials to the administrator of the diocese, José González Rubio, on December 14, 1850. Traveling by ship, he arrived at San Pedro on December 18 and spent two days at the Pueblo of Los Angeles and two days at Mission San Fernando, before proceeding to Mission San Buenaventura. At eleven o'clock in the morning on Christmas Day, December 25, 1850, Alemany arrived at Santa Barbara and presented his documents to González Rubio, thereby officially taking possession of the diocese.[8]

Alemany's arrival must have been a moment of both joy and relief for José González Rubio. He had acquitted himself well during his tenure as governor of the mitre, and his dedication had preserved the Catholic Church in California through a most chaotic time.[9] During the month that the new bishop remained in Santa Barbara, González Rubio shared with him the details and problems of Church

administration, as well as information concerning the status of Church property in the new state. The friar remained consistent in his opinion that mission lands could be claimed only in the name and for the benefit of the Indians to whom they had rightly belonged, but that other property, such as churches, priests' houses, cemeteries, orchards, vineyards, and aquaducts, should justly be claimed for the diocese.[10] On December 30, 1850, González Rubio presented Alemany with all the official decrees, documents, and correspondence contained in the Libro Borrador, to which Alemany affixed his signature.[11] And on New Year's Day, January 1, 1851, the bishop celebrated a pontifical Mass at the mission church in which he preached the sermon and bestowed a pontifical blessing on the large congregation.[12]

But Alemany's arrival was no guarantee that González Rubio was to escape further responsibility for the administration of the Church in California. During the weeks he spent in Santa Barbara, the new bishop developed a great appreciation for González Rubio's talent and dedication, as well as a sympathetic admiration for the value of the missionary vocation he had embraced. This, no doubt, was a product of Alemany's own desire to live and work as a missionary.[13] This affection for González Rubio and respect for the Franciscan contribution to California Catholicism was to be a prime factor in Alemany's future relationships with the Franciscans of Santa Barbara. Accordingly, on January 24, 1851, just prior to leaving Santa Barbara for Monterey, the bishop appointed González Rubio his vicar general for the southern portion of the diocese, extending from Mission San Miguel to the tip of Lower California. In the decree, Alemany stated that he needed the help of such persons who were "virtuous, prudent, and well-informed."[14] On January 28, 1851, González Rubio took the oath of office

and was once again involved in the administration of Catholic affairs in California.[15]

One of González Rubio's experiences during his tenure as Alemany's vicar general for the southern portion of the diocese was his participation in the first synod of the Catholic Church ever to be held in California. On January 21, 1852, the bishop issued a summons to the synod, which was to be held at St. Francis Church in San Francisco, to all the clergy and laity of the diocese. The clergy convened there on March 10, 1852, to participate in communal prayer and spiritual exercises under the direction of the bishop. The synod itself was in session from March 19 to March 23, 1852, with the bishop presiding and González Rubio serving as vice-president. The primary issues discussed were ecclesiastical tithes, the problem of mixed marriages, the recovery of the Pious Fund, and the status of mission lands and Church property.[16] For González Rubio, this synod was the first opportunity to experience the full reality of the American Catholic Church in California, which had been built upon the Franciscan foundations he had so tenaciously preserved between 1846 and 1850. It was the friar's first trip to San Francisco since he had accompanied Bishop García Diego on the episcopal visitation of 1844. He must have been amazed at the city which had arisen on the hills by the bay in the years which intervened.

González Rubio's performance as vicar general of the southern portion of the Diocese of Monterey must have satisfied the bishop. On April 1, 1852, Alemany placed additional confidence in the friar by appointing him vicar general and administrator of the entire diocese.[17] This office was to be exercised during Alemany's absence, while he traveled to the East Coast to attend the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, which was convened in May of 1852.[18]

XUM

And, on January 9, 1853, after returning from the council, Alemany once again appointed González Rubio as vicar general of the entire diocese in the case of his own death or inability to govern.[19] One writer has summarized well the significance of these events for an evaluation of González Rubio's place in California Catholic affairs in the early American period:

> It appeared that González Rubio was the one able link with the past that held the Church in California together until it could be organized under new and changing conditions and the one who was sufficiently versed in the law so as to be able to actually govern the Church in many diverse aspects and who could be trusted with confidence to fill the place of a bishop.[20]

Four months later, on April 29, 1853, the dispute over Catholic jurisdiction in Lower California was settled by a Roman decree which detached the area from the Diocese of Monterey and committed it to the Archbishop of Mexico.[21] The details of this and other relations with the Mexican Catholic Church, especially as they pertain to González Rubio, will be discussed later in this chapter. The importance of this event for Catholic polity in California was the new possibility for the Diocese of Monterey to become officially integrated into the American Catholic hierarchical structure, rather than being directly subordinate to the Church at Rome. On July 29, 1853, Pope Pius IX issued a series of decrees altering the structure of Catholic authority in California. On that day, the Pope created the Archdiocese of San Francisco, encompassing the northern portion of California, and detached the area from Monterey south to the Mexican border, creating the new Diocese of Monterey. The combined area was also constituted as an ecclesiastical province of the Catholic Church in the United States. The Pope appointed Joseph Alemany as the first Archbishop of San Francisco and Thaddeus Amat as the new Bishop of Monterey.[22]

XUM

Thaddeus Amat, the newly appointed Bishop of Monterey, who was to figure so prominently in González Rubio's future activity in California, was born in Barcelonia, Catalonia, Spain, on December 31, 1811. After completing his primary and secondary education, Amat entered the Congregation of the Mission, more popularly known as the Vincentians after their founder St. Vincent de Paul, a community of secular priests bound only by private vows whose primary endeavors were ministering to the poor and directing seminaries. On December 23, 1847, after completing his theological studies in Spain and France, Amat was ordained a priest, and on July 19, 1838, he was assigned to the American Province of the Congregation of the Mission. After teaching and ministering for nine years in the seminaries, novitiates, and parishes of Louisiana and Missouri, Amat was appointed rector of St. Charles Seminary in Philadelphia on October 4, 1847. In 1849, the rector accompanied Bishop Francis Kenrick of Philadelphia to the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore as his official theologian, and in 1852, he fulfilled the same function for Bishop John Neumann, the new Bishop of Philadelphia, at the First Plenary Council of Baltimore. It was at this latter council that Amat was nominated to succeed Alemany as the Bishop of Monterey. Amat attempted to escape the proffered mitre, first by accepting an assignment in Spain, then by hurrying to France to embark for a subsequent appointment in Chile. His further refusals were rejected by Rome, and he accepted the episcopal appointment which had been made on July 29, 1853. Amat was consecrated a bishop on March 24, 1854. After extensive travels in Europe and the Eastern United States in search of financial assistance and personnel for his diocese, he arrived in California in November of 1855.[23]

The fact that more than two years were to elapse between the time that Thaddeus Amat was appointed Bishop of

Monterey and his arrival in the diocese augured further diocesan responsibilities for José González Rubio. On October 18, 1853, Archbishop Alemany wrote to him concerning the new state of affairs.[24] The archbishop encouraged the friar by assuring him of the learning and good character of the new bishop, while lamenting the fact that he himself could not remain in the See of Monterey. He spoke of Amat's attempts to flee the appointment and of his personal fears for the new diocese which he urged González Rubio not to abandon. This last was a reference to the continuous pressure which the Mexican Church was putting on González Rubio to return to Mexico to shepherd the Church in Lower California, which offer the friar had twice refused. In order to insure González Rubio's continued service, the archbishop officially appointed him as administrator of the Diocese of Monterey.

In November of 1853, after Rome had clarified Alemany's responsibility as administrator of the Diocese of Monterey which was suffragan to the Archdiocese of San Francisco, the archbishop named González Rubio successively as vicar capitular and vicar general of the Diocese of Monterey with the explicit task of governing it until Amat arrived.[25] This complexity in California Catholic affairs in the early American period has led one writer to speculate that these

> were apparently days when priests were dodging bishoprics. Amat was playing hide-and-seek with Propaganda and preferred Philadelphia, preferring the Professor's chair to the mitre and crook. González Rubio twice refused Lower California and preferred to remain here. Alemany would have preferred to remain in Monterey.[26]

To this could be added Charles Pius Montgomery's initial refusal of the Diocese of Monterey and Alemany's attempt to follow suit. Such behavior on the part of dedicated churchmen is a good indication of the difficulty of Church

administration and ministry in early American California.[27] The contribution of González Rubio carries added significance in the light of such circumstances, as he worked to regularize Catholic affairs in the Diocese of Monterey according to the Councils of Baltimore and the guidance of the archbishop.[28]

A strong spirit of co-operation existed between Alemany and González Rubio during the period in which the friar served as the archbishop's vicar general for the Diocese of Monterey. In October of 1854, González Rubio once again traveled to San Francisco for another conference of the clergy.[29] No record of the proceedings of this council is available, but a copy of the final decrees, published on October 23, 1854, is located in the archives of Santa Barbara Mission, most probably placed there by González Rubio.[30] The eighteen decrees concerned such topics as regulations for administering the various sacraments, the necessity of fostering Christian educational institutions, and specific directions for marriage cases. Recognizing the reality of cultural pluralism among Anglo-American and Spanish-speaking Catholics, the conference decreed that couples coming from the same cultural background had the right to choose to be married by a priest of that background. In the case of couples representing different cultural or national origins, freedom was given to them to choose the nationality of the officiating priest. Such a decree indicated Alemany's regard for the Spanish-speaking Catholics of California, the vast majority of whom resided in the Diocese of Monterey. Certainly González Rubio's solicitous administration was a key to the archbishop's understanding of the cultural as well as religious tie which the Spanish-speaking Californians had to the Church.[31]

Another area in which González Rubio provided valuable assistance to Archbishop Alemany was the matter

XUM

of protecting and recovering Church land and property. The question of land titles in early American California was a complicated one. In order to properly adjudicate land claims, the Congress of the United States set up a three member Board of Land Commissioners on March 3, 1851.[32] Archbishop Alemany, after extensive legal consultation, filed a claim with the Land Commission to validate the Church's title to ecclesiastical property at all twenty-one missions. This litigation, Land Case 609, commenced on November 15, 1853 and ended with a decision upholding the Church's title on December 18, 1855.[33] In response to a unanimous resolution of the participants in the San Francisco Synod of 1852 which was in harmony with González Rubio's consistent position that the mission lands had been owned by the Indians, Alemany pressed an additional claim to one league of land at each mission which would be granted to the Indians. But, in Land Commission Case 663, this claim was rejected.[34]

During the litigation of these land cases, Archbishop Alemany empowered González Rubio to either recover Church property which had been illegally appropriated or to collect the proper rental fees from those who were occupying or using Church land or property.[35] The friar acted quickly to fulfill the archbishop's request, sparing neither time, diplomacy, nor knowledge.[36] He collected information on various title disputes in the Diocese of Monterey and sent it to San Francisco so it could be included in the archbishop's presentation of the Church's case. Apparently González Rubio also solicited contributions from some of Santa Barbara's leading Catholic citizens to aid the archbishop with the cost of litigation. On January 13, 1855, Alemany wrote the friar to thank him for such financial assistance. He went on to chide González Rubio by telling him that although he had not authorized such begging, he considered it a job well done.[37]

And, in May of 1855, in response to more pressure from the Mexican Church for González Rubio's return, the archbishop told the friar that he could not see any way to administer the Diocese of Monterey with order and efficiency, unless González Rubio continued to function as vicar general.[38]

In November of 1855, the long-awaited Bishop of Monterey, Thaddeus Amat, arrived in San Francisco. He brought with him the pallium, the ceremonial mantle conferred by the Pope on archbishops, which Alemany, due to the great distance between Rome and San Francisco, had never officially received. After presenting his credentials to the archbishop and participating in the ceremony of investiture of the pallium on November 18, Amat proceeded to Monterey for a short visit and finally arrived in Santa Barbara on December 2, 1855. After conferring with González Rubio for several days, the bishop visited Los Angeles and traveled as far south as San Diego before returning to take up his residence in Santa Barbara.[39] Any hopes on the part of González Rubio that the arrival of the bishop would relieve him of responsibility for diocesan administration were soon proven false. On February 23, 1856, Amat officially designated the friar as his vicar general. The bishop also gave González Rubio a specific list of faculties which he might exercise as part of his office. These included the power to prohibit the reading of certain books, to impart a papal blessing to sacred vessels and altar stones, to grant dispensations for a variety of marriage cases, and to grant absolution in the Sacrament of Penance in cases normally reserved to the bishop.[40] This appointment and the concomitant facuties indicated that a harmonious relationship existed between the bishop and González Rubio. However, other problems beset the friar in the years between 1850 and 1856 stemming from the concerted effort of Church authorities

XUM

in Mexico to effect his return to the land of his birth.

It will be recalled that between June of 1850, when Alemany received the mitre of the newly-created Diocese of Monterey, and April of 1853, when Lower California was returned to Mexican Catholic jurisdiction, the new diocese, although administered by an American bishop, included a large portion of Mexican territory. While official negotiations were being carried on in Rome, Mexico City, and San Francisco to remedy this unusual situation, González Rubio's status remained ambiguous, since the Archbishop of Mexico City, the College of Guadalupe at Zacatecas, and Archbishop Alemany were contending for his loyalties. Early in 1851, Father Bernardino Pérez, the Guardian of the College of Guadalupe, counseled González Rubio that his primary responsibility lay in ministering to that part of the new diocese which was located in Mexican territory, that is Lower California.[41] On May 6, 1851, Archbishop Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros of Mexico City informed González Rubio that the Mexican government was urging the appointment of a vicar apostolic, with the office of bishop, to vindicate its right to Catholic authority in Lower California, and four days later the archbishop's secretary forwarded González Rubio copies of all the pertinent correspondence in the matter so he could stay abreast of the developments.[42] In the summer of 1851, the friar was notified that the Mexican government would not recognize the spiritual authority of Bishop Alemany in Lower California, and that he himself, as the legitimate successor of Bishop García Diego, was being nominated as the episcopal vicar apostolic of the territory.[43] And in December of 1851, Father Pérez again wrote to González Rubio informing him that the petitions had been filed in Rome urging the official restoration of Lower California to Mexican Catholic authority.[44]

XUM

This vacillation regarding González Rubio's future continued through 1852. On January 21 of that year, Urbano Fonseca, the Mexican Minister of Justice and Ecclesiastical Affairs, wrote to the friar that there was no legitimate Catholic authority in Lower California except that which González Rubio had received from the late Bishop Francisco García Diego.[45] The minister then ordered González Rubio to remove himself immediately to Lower California to provisionally exercise his authority there until confirmation of his appointment as bishop of the territory arrived from Rome. Fonseca concluded by warning the friar most emphatically to reject any authority which Bishop Alemany was claiming over Mexican territory. The friar sent a letter to the College of Guadalupe on February 24, 1852 expressing his apprehension at the possibility of being forced to accept the bishopric.[46] On June 30, 1852, Father Diego Palomar, the president of the college, informed González Rubio that, at the insistence of Bishop Alemany, he would be allowed to continue serving as the bishop's vicar general; but, at best, this was considered a temporary arrangement, since two months later Father Pérez wrote from Zacatecas that the advisors of the college had unanimously agreed that he should accept the mitre of Lower California if the appointment were confirmed by Rome.[47] This confirmation was quickly forthcoming. On December 4, 1852, Archbishop Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros informed González Rubio that he had been officially appointed vicar apostolic of Lower California with the office of bishop.[48]

González Rubio received notification of the appointment on February 7, 1853. On the same day he drafted a letter in which he expressed his unworthiness and incompetence for the task. He wrote that neither his physical strength nor his mental powers measured up to the demands of the assignment. After thanking the archbishop

XUM

for the honor of the appointment, he wrote that he must decline to accept it.[49] In March, 1853, a second request was sent to González Rubio from Mexico City stating more cogent reasons for the friar's acceptance of the proffered office. But González Rubio stood firmly by his original decision and, in a letter dated April 30, 1853, he stated flatly that he was "not the one destined by God" to shepherd the Catholic Church in Lower California.[50] Earlier in April of 1853 the final legal transfer of Lower California from the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Monterey to the Mexican Catholic Church was accomplished and González Rubio received no other requests to assume diocesan responsibilities in Mexico. On November 22, 1853, Father Diego Palomar informed González Rubio that in light of the need for priests in American California he would be allowed to remain at his post there until the diocese was sufficiently staffed.[51]

Through 1854 and early 1855 González Rubio worked at the task of administering the Diocese of Monterey as vicar general in the absence of Bishop Amat and aiding Archbishop Alemany in the litigation of title to Church property. In May of 1855, events occurred in Mexico which once again rendered the friar's future uncertain. Although he had been continuously absent from the College of Guadalupe at Zacatecas since 1832, almost twenty-three years, he was elected guardian of the college on May 16, 1855.[52] Late in July, 1855, González Rubio received news of the appointment in a letter from Father Miguel Guzman, the commissary-prefect of the missions of the college, who informed him that the college anxiously awaited his leadership in the badly needed reform of the regular clergy[53] in Mexico, citing his success as governor of the mitre in California as proof that he would also succeed as guardian of the college.[54] In the period before González Rubio's expected return

to Zacatecas, Father Diego Palomar was appointed interim president by Bishop Clemente Murguía of Michoacán, the apostolic delegate for the reform of the regulars in the Mexican Republic. On July 28, 1855, Palomar wrote González Rubio that Murguía sent his congratulations on the appointment and that the bishop also anxiously awaited his return.[55] Hence both the Mexican hierarchy and González Rubio's own Franciscan colleagues once again were urging him to abandon California to continue his ministry in Mexico.

In August and September of 1855, González Rubio directed letters to the College of Guadalupe in response to his appointment as guardian. On August 19, the friar stated that he lacked the talent, both the physical and mental ability, to do the job well. In light of this, he felt that his acceptance of the position would do more harm than good to the college and, therefore, he wished to decline the offer, saying that this was "more sincere proof" of his love for the institution.[56] Answering Father Palomar's letter of July 28, González Rubio wrote, on September 4, 1855, that his desire was to serve the college as the least of its members, not as the superior. Once again, the friar pleaded that his failing strength could not support the serious responsibility of the guardianship and that his ineptitude would be the occasion of much harm to the community at Zacatecas and, once again, he declined to accept the office.[57] But González Rubio's arguments failed to convince the officers of the college. In November, 1855, Father Palomar sent the friar two more letters informing him that the advisors of the college and Bishop Murguía still remained certain that he could do an excellent job as guardian and that his acceptance was essential to the well-being, peace, and tranquility of the college.[58]

The cogent insistence of Father Palomar at last

XUM

convinced González Rubio that he had no other choice but to accept the guardianship and to proceed at once to Zacatecas. Accordingly, in January of 1856, the friar set about making preparations to leave. At the conclusion of Mass on January 20, González Rubio, overcome with tears, announced to the assembled worshippers that his departure for Mexico was imminent since he had been recalled by his college. This caused many in the congregation, young and old, men and women, to also break into tears and, on the same day, a group of Santa Barbara's leading citizens began to plot as to how they might assume the responsibility of causing González Rubio, whom they praised as a useful and virtuous religious constantly solicitous for their spiritual needs, to remain with them.[59] This entire episode is best related in an article which appeared in El Clamor Público,[60] a Spanish-language newspaper published in Los Angeles, on February 9, 1856:

> "On more than one occasion we have heard people speaking of the exemplary virtues of the Reverend Padre González. Our correspondent has favored us with the following account, which we publish with great relish. Without doubt, it will be read with great interest. (Ed.)
>
> "Santa Barbara, January 31, 1856.
>
> "On the 22nd of the present month, there occured in this city, one of those events rare in the history of towns, which will be remembered and transmitted down through generations. The event which we are going to describe, we shall tell as concisely as possible, and no doubt, will be pleasant reading to all who have known the personage who is to occupy our attention.
>
> "The Rev. Fr. González of the Franciscan Order, a member of the Missionary College of Our Lady of Guadalupe of Zacatecas, who, at present, is in charge of the parish of Santa Barbara and vicar-general of this diocese, recently received an order to return to his college to preside thereover as guardian, to which office his brethren had elected him.

"In vain did he forward his resignation for a new election called him to the same office. Accompanying the news of his re-election was an order to present himself at the college. Despite his vehement desire to end his days among his parishioners, he resolved to obey the order of his superiors. On the 20th, after Mass, his eyes bathed in tears, and with a tender feeling of love in his heart toward his flock,--a love that was reciprocated on the part of his audience,--he made known the fatal order which was to separate him, perhaps forever, from them. He said farewell to all.

"It is impossible to describe the great emotions this news engendered in the townspeople. The beautiful qualities of this worthy missionary have made him an object of veneration to all Catholics, and of respect and esteem to all others of this city.

"Thus, as soon as his coming departure was noised abroad, the people agreed to make use of the most respected persons to persuade him not to depart, by recalling to him the enormous void that would be left in the parish for he would deprive them of his model exemplary life and virtues and the College of Our Lady of Sorrows of this city, one of its principal supports. This was done, but in vain, for neither pleading, reasoning, nor circumstantial remarks succeeded in shattering his determination to obey his superiors and thus gave an example of the obedience he had so frequently made the subject of his sermons.

"Seeing that every method of persuasion failed, the people resolutely determined to prevent his departure. Fearing that he would leave without being seen, they appointed several citizens to be on the qui vive. Finally on the 22nd, at 10 o'clock, as soon as the smoke of the steamer on which he was to sail was seen on the horizon, the worthy missionary went to the point of embarcation where a small boat was waiting to take him aboard. But alas, vain hope! When he arrived at the beach, the boat was already surrounded by 15 or 20 men who had orders not to allow the padre to embark.

> "Almost at the same time that he arrived at the beach, there arrived about 1000 persons of both sexes and of every nationality and creed, all moved, as if by the instinct of a common desire to detain this respectable gentleman. There they formed one body and surrounded his carriage. Don Francisco de la Guerra came up to him and in the name of all told him with all due respect, that the townspeople had determined to oppose his departure by every means and that it was useless for him to think of going away for it was impossible for him to move a step forward toward the ocean. De la Guerra pleaded with him to return to his abode. But the padre remained firm in his resolve. Yet to his every statement, the answer came that the people were aware of his reasons for going but still remained determined to withhold their consent; furthermore, it was impossible to persuade them to think otherwise.
>
> "Consequently, the order was given to the driver of the carriage to return the padre to his habitation. Afterwards representatives of the people were sent to Archbishop Alemany, in the absence of Bishop Amat, asking him to intercede with the superiors of Father González to allow him to remain here; if necessary, the Archbishop was to intercede with the Holy Father. We hope that through so worthy an intercessor we shall obtain the object of our desires."[61]

That the citizens of Santa Barbara did invoke the aid and intercession of Archbishop Alemany in the matter was corroborated in letters which the prelate addressed to José and Pablo de la Guerra in late January and February of 1856. The archbishop promised that both himself and Bishop Amat would do everything possible to see that so valuable a priest as González Rubio would not be lost to the Catholics of California.[62] Early in February, González Rubio took pen in hand to explain the episode to his colleagues at the College of Guadalupe:

XUM

> Hardly had I gone forth from this habitation using every precaution, when the people of this town of Santa Barbara came closely following me and at the beach formed an impenetrable wall which precluded my departure. All my efforts were futile, my persuading, protests, and pleadings were all in vain, until finally in possession of my person, and having placed me in my carriage, they brought me forcefully to this college, where I discovered my small travelling equipment had already been returned.[63]

In April and May of 1856, officials of the College of Guadalupe acquiesced to the pressures created by the episode at Santa Barbara and the intercession of Alemany and Amat, by exempting González Rubio from his election to the guardianship of the college and giving him permission to remain in California.[64] But the decisive moment came on June 24, 1856, when the Minister General of the Franciscan Order in Rome officially detached González Rubio from the College of Guadalupe at Zacatecas and incorporated him into the College of Our Lady of Sorrows at Santa Barbara.[65] From that day the friar belonged uncontestably to the Catholic Church in American California.

The years between 1850 and 1856 were a time of cultural, political and religious turmoil in California as the new Anglo-American inhabitants struggled to ratify their possession of the new state, and the Spanish-speaking minority fought to conserve whatever could be saved of their former dignity and property. The change from Hispanic to Anglo cultural dominance came much more quickly in the North, particularly in San Francisco itself, due to the great influx of non-Spanish-speaking persons occasioned by the discovery of gold and silver. But this change did not occur without violence. In 1851 and 1856, Committees of Vigilance were formed in San Francisco in

which citizens took responsibility for the maintenance of law and order.[66] The same brand of vigilante justice was commonly meted out in the mining districts of the Sierra Nevada foothills in the eastern portion of California.[67] The Spanish-speaking and other "foreigners" were often the victims of these attempts to assert the power of the new Anglo-American majority.

In Southern California the same climate of strife and violence prevailed in the 1850's. In 1854, an average of one homicide a day was reported in Los Angeles, and most of the victims were either Mexicans or Indians.[68] Throughout the southern portion of the state, bands of Spanish-speaking outlaws, both Californian and Mexican, terrorized the countryside in what they felt was justifiable revenge for the disenfranchisement they were suffering at the hands of the new American inhabitants of the state.[69] Tiburcio Vásquez, a native Californian who engaged in such activity, gave a concise statement of the Spanish-speaking rationale for such violent retaliation:

> A spirit of hatred and revenge took possession of me. I had numerous fights in defense of what I believed to be my rights and those of my countrymen. I believed that we were being unjustly deprived of the social rights that belonged to us.[70]

Santa Barbara, where González Rubio resided continually during this period with the exception of two brief journeys to San Francisco, was not isolated from the violence that afflicted the rest of Southern California. In 1853, an incident occurred in which American and Spanish-speaking contingents of citizens took opposing sides. Two lives were ultimately lost in fights arising out of an attempt by a group of American ex-soldiers to forcefully usurp a tract of land which belonged to Santa Barbara

Mission.[71] But the political control of Santa Barbara by the Spanish-speaking, particularly the De la Guerra, Carrillo and Covarrubias families, was largely unchallenged by Anglo-Americans in the 1850's. Even when the majority of California state offices were occupied by the anti-Catholic, anti-foreigner Know-Nothings in the elections of 1855, the Southern California counties resisted the trend, and the most resounding defeat of Know-Nothing candidates by Spanish-surname Democrats came in Santa Barbara.[72] This political control of Santa Barbara carried strong cultural connotations as well. In 1855, three-fifths of the twelve hundred inhabitants spoke only Spanish and, in spite of American Protestant opposition, they succeeded in having the classes in the local public school carried on totally in Spanish.[73]

Alongside of the currents of political and cultural ferment in Santa Barbara in this period, González Rubio had occasion to witness a touching and unusual episode in the town's history. In July of 1853, an Indian woman was found on San Nicolas Island, off the coast of Santa Barbara, who had lived there alone for eighteen years since the rest of her tribe had been removed in 1835. Displaying no fear of her discoverers, she accompanied them back to the town where, although no one could understand her language, her incredible adventure and charming ways endeared her to many. "She was about fifty years of age, of medium height, rather thick-set, strong and active."[74] González Rubio sought permission and sent her dresses, bone needles, and other implements she had fashioned to Rome. But the rapid shift in her environment soon took its toll. Seven weeks after her arrival, the woman became ill from eating too much fruit and died shortly thereafter. During her illness she was conditionally baptized and given the name Juana María. On October 19, 1853, González Rubio conducted her funeral services and gave her ecclesiastical

burial in the mission cemetery. Certainly the friar, as well as many others, must have been moved by the strange fate of "this resourceful, valiant, and self-contained woman who had no one to talk to in eighteen years and survived."[75]

NOTES

CHAPTER VI

[1]McGloin, California's First Archbishop, pp. 77-78. The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide is that arm of the Roman Catholic Church which deals with missionary territories. The United States was regarded as missionary territory until 1908.

[2]McGloin, op. cit., pp. 80-82. Joseph Thompson, El Gran Capitan (Los Angeles: Cabrera and Sons, 1961), pp. 220-225.

[3]For a summary of the proceedings and decrees of the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore cf. Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore, pp. 154-163.

[4]McGloin, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

[5]Ibid., pp. 90-95.

[6]Guilday, op. cit., p. 161. The problem of jurisdiction in the Diocese of Monterey was a touchy one since part of the diocese, Lower California, lay in Mexican territory.

[7]This biographical information is found in McGloin, op. cit., pp. 25-65, 76-95.

[8]Ibid., pp. 96-112.

[9]McGloin feels that González Rubio deserves the title "Savior of the Catholic Church" in California for his work between 1846 and 1850. cf. ibid., p. 73, note 10.

[10]Ibid., p. 131. cf. chap. v, note 59 above.

[11]Libro Borrador, December 30, 1850, SBMA. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 683.

[12]McGloin, op. cit., p. 113.

[13]Ibid., pp. 43-65.

[14]Alemany to González Rubio, Mission Santa Barbara, January 24, 1851, SBMA.

[15]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 684.

[16]Zephyrin Engelhardt, "The First Ecclesiastical Synod of California, March 19-23, 1852," Catholic Historical Review, I (April, 1905), 30-37. cf. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 692-694. McGloin, op. cit., pp. 135-136.

[17]Alemany, San Francisco, April 1, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[18]For a summary of the proceedings and decrees of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore cf. Guilday, op. cit., pp. 167-186.

[19]Alemany to González Rubio, Mission Santa Barbara, January 9, 1853, SBMA.

[20]Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 32-33.

[21]Ibid., p. 33. cf. McGloin, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

[22]Rome, July 29, 1853, SBMA. Rome, July 29, 1853, SBMA. Rome, July 29, 1853, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 710-711. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:2 (October, 1948), 59. Guilday, op. cit., p. 188.

[23]This biographical information is found in Francis J. Weber, California's Reluctant Prelate (Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1964), pp. 1-28.

[24]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, October 18, 1853, SBMA. cf. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[25]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, November 3, 1853, SBMA. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, November 19, 1853, SBMA.

[26]Geiger, op. cit., p. 60.

[27]For a fine study of how the difficulty of these years also affected the Protestant churches in Southern California cf. Hogue,"A History of Religion," passim.

[28]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, December 17, 1853, SBMA.

[29]Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 33.

[30]Ordinationes, San Francisco, October 23, 1854, SBMA.

[31]Cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 713-714.

XUM

[32]For a good summary of the larger political and cultural ramifications of the land title settlements in California cf. Bean, California, pp. 152-171. For a good treatment of the effect which these decisions had on the Spanish-speaking Californians cf. Leonard Pitt, The Decline of the Californios (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), pp. 83-103.

[33]For a summary of this litigation and the decree of the Land Commission cf. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 731-745.

[34]Bancroft, History of California, V, 564-565. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 745.

[35]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, December 16, 1854, SBMA.

[36]Cf. González Rubio, blotter, Mission Santa Barbara, December 19, 1854, SBMA. González Rubio to Arnaz, Mission Santa Barbara, December 25, 1854, SBMA. Arnaz to González Rubio, San Buenaventura, December 31, 1854, SBMA.

[37]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, January 13, 1855, SBMA.

[38]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, May 28, 1855, SBMA.

[39]Cf. Weber, op. cit., pp. 38-42.

[40]Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, February 23, 1856, SBMA. Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, February 23, 1856, SBMA.

[41]Pérez to González Rubio, Zacatecas, January 13, 1851, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 668.

[42]Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros to González Rubio, Mexico City, May 6, 1851, SBMA. Primo de Rivera to González Rubio, Mexico City, May 10, 1851, SBMA.

[43]Espinosa to González Rubio, Mexico City, June 4, 1851, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

[44]Pérez to González Rubio, Zacatecas, December 27, 1851, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 670.

[45]Fonseca to González Rubio, Mexico City, January 21, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 672.

[46]Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 670.

[47]Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, June 30, 1852, SBMA. Pérez to González Rubio, Zacatecas, August 27, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 670, 692.

[48]Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros to González Rubio, Mexico City, December 4, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 673. González Rubio was appointed vicar apostolic as well as bishop because the problem of national Catholic jurisdiction over Lower California had not yet been settled. Therefore, the area still remained ecclesiastically subject directly to Rome.

[49]González Rubio, blotter, Mission Santa Barbara, February 7, 1853, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 673-674.

[50]González Rubio to Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros, Mission Santa Barbara, April 30, 1853, SBMA. Ibid..

[51]Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, November 22, 1853, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 698. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:2 (October, 1948), 61.

[52]Macías to González Rubio, Zacatecas, May 20, 1855, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 711. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," ibid., XI:3 (January, 1949), 111.

[53]This refers to members of religious orders rather than secular or diocesan priests who labor directly under the authority of a bishop.

[54]Guzmán to González Rubio, Zacatecas, May 21, 1855, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit.. Geiger, loc. cit..

[55]Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, July 28, 1855, SBMA. ibid..

[56]González Rubio to Guzmán, Mission Santa Barbara, August 19, 1855, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit.. Geiger, loc. cit..

[57]González Rubio to Palomar, Mission Santa Barbara, September 4, 1855, SBMA. ibid..

[58]Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, November 10, 1855, SBMA. Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, November 17, 1855, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit..

XUM

[59]Carrillo to De la Guerra, Santa Barbara, January 20, 1856, SBMA.

[60]For an evaluation of the significance of this newspaper for the history of the Spanish-speaking in early American California cf. Pitt, op. cit., pp. 181-194.

[61]El Clamor Público (Los Angeles), February 9, 1856. This translation is found in Maynard Geiger, "The Detailed Story of the 'Kidnapping' of Father González Rubio, O.F.M.," Provincial Annals, VI:1 (January, 1944), 8-10. cf. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, pp. 342-343. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, pp. 158-161. Pitt, op. cit., pp. 217-218. Pitt incorrectly asserts that González Rubio did in fact leave California at this point. The Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, referred in this account, was founded in Santa Barbara on July 23, 1854 to train Franciscan priests for ministry in California. This institution will be treated in depth in succeeding chapters.

[62]Alemany to J. de la Guerra, San Francisco, January 31, 1856, SBMA. Alemany to P. de la Guerra, San Francisco. February 12, 1856, SBMA.

[63]González Rubio to Palomar, Mission Santa Barbara, February 5, 1856, SBMA. This translation is found in Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:3 (January, 1949), 111.

[64]Alegre to González Rubio, Zacatecas, April 19, 1856, SBMA. Palomar to González Rubio, Zacatecas, May 13, 1856, SBMA. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 712.

[65]Rome, June 24, 1856, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., IV, 713. Geiger, op. cit., p. 114.

[66]For a summary of vigilante activity in these years cf. Bean, op. cit., pp. 136-151.

[67]For a treatment of the anti-Spanish-speaking violence in the mining districts of California in this period cf. Pitt, op. cit., pp. 48-68.

[68]Carey McWilliams, North From Mexico (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 131.

[69]Ibid., pp. 127-131. Pitt, op. cit., pp. 148-161.

[70]McWilliams, op. cit., p. 130. This continuing lawlessness and lack of order in Southern California made it extremely difficult for ministers of religion to exercise their calling. For a fine picture of the effects of these pressures on religion in Southern California cf. Hogue, "A History of Religion," passim.

[71]Pitt, op. cit., pp. 106-107.

[72]Ibid., pp. 135-137. The Spanish-speaking Californians sarcastically translated the term 'Know Nothings' as 'Ignorantes.' cf. Peyton Hurt, "The Rise and Fall of the 'Know Nothings' in California," California Historical Society Quarterly, IX (March and June, 1930), 16-49, 99-128.

[73]Pitt, op. cit., p. 226.

[74]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 150.

[75]Ibid., p. 151.

CHAPTER VII

THE GENESIS OF DISSENSION (1852-1858)

Late in 1851, there were five Franciscan priests in the entire State of California. With the exception of Father Antonio Ánzar at San Juan Bautista, they all resided at Santa Barbara Mission. This group included Fathers José González Rubio, Francisco Sánchez, José Joaquín Jimeno, and Antonio Jimeno. The fortunes of Franciscanism in the new state were at a low ebb since the possibility of new manpower from Mexico had never materialized. In light of such circumstances the four friars at Santa Barbara deliberated concerning their future and decided that they wished to establish a small missionary college to train Franciscans for ministry in California and thus insure the continuation of their order in the state.[1] In the fall of 1851, they made their plan known to Bishop Alemany who received it with such enthusiasm that he set about obtaining Roman permission for them to proceed.[2] In November of 1851, Alemany directed letters to Pope Pius IX and the Congregation of Propaganda Fide asking that both the Franciscans and the Dominicans be allowed to found missionary colleges with the power of receiving novices into their orders.[3] And on February 1, 1852, the bishop wrote directly to the Minister General of the Franciscan Order in Rome requesting that the Franciscans in California be allowed to found an apostolic college with the privilege of a novitiate to supply badly needed priests for his diocese.[4]

XUM

Bishop Alemany's letters of November, 1851, reached Rome in the winter of 1852, where, on February 18, they were annotated to indicate that the petitions for the establishment of apostolic missionary colleges in California by the Franciscans and Dominicans were under consideration.[5] On the same day, February 18, 1852, Cardinal Alessandro Barnabò, Secretary of Propaganda Fide, relayed the request to Father Antonio de Rignano, the Delegate General of the Franciscan Order, who willingly gave his consent to the proposal three days later on February 21, 1852.[6] After further consultation with the definitors, or advisors, of the Franciscan Order, Barnabò had an audience with Pope Pius IX in which he urged the Pope to grant the request. On February 29, 1852, Pius IX gave his formal permission for the establishment of a Franciscan missionary college in California.[7]

On April 1, 1852, Father Antonio de Rignano, the Franciscan Delegate General, wrote to Bishop Alemany communicating his enthusiastic consent for the foundation of a friary or college in California and giving Father José Joaquín Jimeno the necessary faculties to establish such a foundation.[8]

In January of 1853, after all the appropriate permissions had been received, there gathered at Santa Barbara the four resident Franciscans, Bishop Alemany, and Father Jesús Orruño, the guardian of San Fernando College in Mexico City. On January 5, it was resolved that the new institution should be provisionally established as a friary with the title of hospice, and it was so constituted on January 7, 1853. Father José Joaquín Jimeno was installed as superior. On the intervening day, January 6, 1853, Alemany gave his permission for the future foundation of the apostolic college

itself.[9] Three months later, on April 18, 1853, the bishop officially granted Father Jimeno permission to found the apostolic college at Santa Barbara Mission. As a sign of his high regard for Father González Rubio, Alemany included the stipulation that the friar was to remain as pastor of the congregation of the town of Santa Barbara with his preference as to living quarters in the mission for as long as he desired.[10]

During the remainder of 1853, new factors arose which occasioned a shift in plans for the location of the new college. After the Franciscans seriously appraised the state of the mission buildings, it became apparent that costly renovation would have to be undertaken to render them usable as a novitiate and college. The cost of renovation would exceed the cost of constructing new buildings, and this was an important factor in light of the financial difficulty the friars were undergoing.[11] In addition, after July 29, 1853, Archbishop Alemany doubted his right to grant the Santa Barbara Mission to the friars since the matter was then under the jurisdiction of Thaddeus Amat, the new Bishop of Monterey, in whose diocese the mission was located.[12] In spite of his uncertainty, Alemany proceeded with his request, but, on May 29, 1854, Cardinal Giacomo Fransoni, Prefect of Propaganda Fide, denied it, stating that Alemany should wait until Amat's arrival to enlist the new bishop's cooperation which the Cardinal was sure would be forthcoming.[13] In the meantime, Archbishop Alemany had decided on other, more practical, reasons for the establishment of the apostolic college in the town of Santa Barbara itself. He felt that the Catholic population would benefit from easier access to the spir-

XUM

itual ministrations of the friars there rather than at the mission which at that time was about a mile from the town's central area. This decision was communicated to the friars in April of 1854.[14]

In the spring of 1854, the first attempts of the Franciscans to purchase the house of José Antonio Aguirre for the purpose of locating the apostolic college there failed.[15] On June 3, 1854, however, they succeeded in purchasing the house of Nicolás Den, located on the northeast corner of State and Figueroa Streets in downtown Santa Barbara, for $8,500; $1,500 of which was to be paid in the first year and the balance in the next five years.[16] In June and July, the house was remodeled to consist of living quarters for the friars and novices and a chapel which was to serve temporarily as the town parish until a new church building could be erected for the Catholic populace. This was necessary since the presidio chapel had long been unusable for worship.[17] On May 28, 1854, it had been decreed in Rome that the new institution would be formally erected as an apostolic college with all the concomitant rights and privileges according to the laws of Pope Pius VI.[18] After all these practical and legal details were completed, the new college was ready to celebrate its foundation.

The official inauguration of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows took place on Sunday, July 23, 1854. The details of the events were recorded in a lengthy statement by José González Rubio.[19] The townspeople and the friars gathered in the college chapel at nine o'clock in the morning for the celebration of Mass, with Father González Rubio acting as principal celebrant and Father Francisco Sánchez

preaching the sermon. After the gospel was proclaimed, all the official permissions for the founding of the institution were read to the assembled congregation. At the end of Mass the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows was declared officially established. Later on the same day, at five o'clock in the afternoon, the congregation assembled once again in the college chapel for the recitation of the Rosary. After Father José Joaquín Jimino, the superior, gave an address, he officially received the first novices into the college and the Franciscan Order. They were José Godayol, Francisco Codina, and José Alcina.[20] In addition, Geronimo López and José Hermenegildo Sal were received as lay brothers. With the completion of these ceremonies, the apostolic college was declared open.[21] Five days later, Archbishop Alemany penned a letter to José Joaquín Jimeno expressing the joy, satisfaction, and hope which the establishment of the college had given him, and promising continued moral and financial support for the institution in the future.[22]

Although José González Rubio had been appointed by Alemany as pastor of the town of Santa Barbara in April of 1853, he continued to live at the mission rather than at the apostolic college while preparations were being made to erect a new parish church in the town itself.[23] On April 21, 1853, González Rubio had presented a petition to the Santa Barbara City Council for a piece of land in the town. On April 29, the petition was granted and, since the donation of the land was legally forbidden, it was sold to the friar for $1.00.[24] On August 5, 1854, this piece of property, located on the southeast corner of State and Figueroa Streets, across

the street from the apostolic college, was officially designated as the site of Our Lady of Sorrows Church.[25] González Rubio, as pastor and vicar general, raised a fund of $6,000 from private donations for the building project. In addition, Archbishop Alemany, José de la Guerra, Manuel Jimeno, and Father Jesús Orruño each personally contributed $500. The Church

> was of adobe without a tower and measured 69 feet in length, 33 in width and 20 in height. The floor of the church was of pavement brick, that of the sacristy of planed boards. Certain bells, vestments, statues and paintings had been brought down from the mission to embellish the new edifice.[26]

On July 29, 1855, the second anniversary of the founding of the Diocese of Monterey, the new church was officially dedicated.[27]

This state of affairs persisted until Bishop Amat arrived to take up his residence in Santa Barbara early in 1856.[28] After residing briefly at the mission, the bishop decided that it was an inconvenient location due to its distance from the town. At the same time, he felt that the space at the new apostolic college was not adequate to provide for future growth in personnel and that it would be more prudent for the Franciscan novices to receive their training away from the diversions of the town. Accordingly, he twice proposed to Father José Joaquín Jimeno, the superior of the college, that the friars exchange their downtown location for the mission and Father Jimeno twice refused. A short time later, on March 14, 1856, José Joaquín Jimeno died, and his brother, Antonio Jimeno, succeeded to the office of superior. Just as the bishop had given up on the possibility of the exchange, the new superior acquiesced to his request.[29] Although both the bishop and the Franciscans adverted to the necessity of Roman permission for the exchange, Amat caused it to take place in late

March or early April, contending that the permission would undoubtedly be forthcoming. José González Rubio administered baptism as pastor of the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows for the last time on March 26, 1856, and Amat appointed Father Blas Raho, a fellow Vincentian, as the new pastor, advising him to follow the previous schedule of religious functions in order to effect the change with minimal disturbance to the parishioners.[30]

On April 2, 1856, the bishop requested permission for the exchange from Propaganda Fide, and on July 6, 1856, it was granted.[31] The terms of the exchange provided that the bishop would receive title to the college building and church in Santa Barbara, while the Franciscans received perpetual use of the mission with adjoining living quarters, two gardens and a vineyard.[32] Having returned to their familiar surroundings at the mission, the friars petitioned Pope Pius IX to allow their institution to retain the title of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, which request the Pope granted.[33]

The social and cultural experience of the Spanish-speaking Catholics of California in the 1850's was a complex and bitter one. They saw themselves as victims of American expansionism who were being disenfranchised socially, culturally, politically, and economically, under the new American regime. As early as 1849, the Spanish-speaking Californians had been made aware of the racist and prejudicial attitudes of the Americans in the Gold Rush, when a combination of violence and discriminatory taxation had been effectively used to drive Spanish-speaking miners from the gold fields.[34] This activity caused the Spanish-speaking to lose faith in the integrity of the new Anglo-American inhabitants of California. These doubts concerning the behavior of individual Americans were extended to include the American legal system as well, in light of the activity of the United States Board of Land Commissioners. This commission, established in 1851 by the Congress of the

United States to adjudicate claims to land in California granted under Mexican authority, met from 1852 to 1856. The practical outcome of the commission's work was the economic ruin of the Spanish-speaking ranchers in the state. Even in cases which were ultimately decided in favor of the Spanish-speaking, the unfamiliar labyrinth of judicial procedures, the high cost of litigation, and the seemingly inexhaustible series of appeals tended to economically drain the claimants. The average length of time required to validate title was seventeen years and, in many cases, the financial benefits of such prolonged litigation accrued not to the claimant, but to Anglo-American lawyers, bankers, and land speculators.[35]

The Spanish-speaking inhabitants of Santa Barbara were by no means exempt from the upheaval which plagued their countrymen in other parts of California. In the early 1850's, new wealth came to the town with increased immigration, the Gold Rush, and a resultant rise in cattle prices.[36] Such affluence was a new factor in the experience of the Santa Barbara populace and it gave rise to social problems on a new scale. Gambling, drunkenness, prostitution, robbery, and murder reached alarming proportions. During this period in the early 1850's, thirty-two out of fifty business licenses issued in Santa Barbara were for liquor establishments.[37] Racial tensions ran high between the Spanish-speaking and Anglo-Americans, who were greatly outnumbered throughout the decade of the 1850's, and violence was often the result. In concert with the larger Hispanic population of California, the Spanish-speaking of Santa Barbara also grew distrustful of American legal procedures and were slow to learn the values, priorities, customs, and civic responsibilities of the new American regime, as well as the English language. Such attitudes on the part of the Spanish-speaking were part of their self-awareness as a conquered people and their at-

tempts to escape or postpone their actual subjection to the new American order.

Throughout the spring and summer of 1856, Bishop Amat experienced the reality of this social and cultural turmoil in Santa Barbara. The prelate was dismayed at the apparent inability of religious principles to modify and ameliorate the public and private behavior of the town's Catholic population which was composed almost totally of the Spanish-speaking segment of the populace. In this evaluation, Amat shared the views of Charles E. Huse, a Protestant, Harvard-educated lawyer, who had emigrated from Massachusetts to Santa Barbara in 1852. In his personal diary, Huse recorded his impressions of Santa Barbara in the 1850's and he

> considered Catholics of Hispanic background very correct in the observance of external worship and ceremonies and regular in attending church but he found little in them to commend in the exercise of good works and in the genuine practice of Christianity.[38]

In September of 1856, Bishop Amat officially responded to the chaotic state of affairs in a pastoral letter which strongly reprimanded the faithful and admonished them to mend their ways.[39] These words fell on the sensitive ears of an already harried people who were accustomed to receive their spiritual ministrations from the Franciscan priests who had shared with them the harsh reality of Santa Barbara's rebirth as an American possession. Instead, the admonition had come from an unfamiliar bishop whose tone may have seemed judgmental rather than paternal to them. The result was the birth of subtle, but very real, dissension among the leaders of the Church in Santa Barbara.

By October of 1856, this incipient tension had become a matter of clear fact to Bishop Amat. Earlier in the fall the bishop had requested that the friars at the apostolic college go to Mission San Luis Rey to labor among the Indians there, which request the Franciscans had em-

phatically refused. This refusal is not surprising since the departure of the friars from Santa Barbara in essence would have meant the termination of the college after only one year of operation.[40] Certainly such a suggestion by the new bishop, coming so quickly after the hasty removal of the college back to the mission, must have shocked the friars, especially after the comfortable relationship they had enjoyed with Archbishop Alemany. The Catholic citizens of the town, having been the object of Amat's stern reprimands and resenting the putative disregard of the bishop for the rights and desires of the Franciscans, began to resent the new episcopal authority. The bishop, sensing that the primary loyalty of the Catholics of the town was to the friars, resolved that two centers of ecclesiastical authority could not exist harmoniously in Santa Barbara.[41] Accordingly, Amat, in spite of Franciscan reluctance, decided that the best solution was to relocate the friars at Mission San Luis Rey. In October, 1856, the bishop wrote to the Prefect of Propaganda Fide and the Franciscan Minister General stating that among the friars there had arisen some abuses, which he left unspecified, that he and his priests were labeled as innovators and heretics by the Santa Barbara Catholics, that a veritable schism was in progress, and that the best solution was to move the friars to San Luis Rey and discontinue the apostolic college.[42]

On January 3, 1857, Father Bernardino de Montefranco, the Minister General of the Franciscan Order, wrote to Propaganda Fide defending the Santa Barbara Franciscans against the plans and accusations of Bishop Amat. He recalled the Franciscan contribution to the Catholic Church in California and the hardships which the friars had endured in being hastily transferred back to the mission where they labored hard to sustain their apostolic college. He suggested that Amat and his priests had been designated as heretics and innovators because of the imprudent fervor of their moral crusading

and that the cause of the disorder could not be disclosed until the bishop clarified the nature of the abuses and practices he had attributed to the friars.[43] By mid-1857 it had become clear to many of the parties concerned in the controversy that Amat's most basic desire was to discontinue the apostolic college. In May, 1857, Father Jesús Covarrubias, the guardian of San Fernando College, wrote from Mexico City that Amat's plan would certainly be frustrated by the proper authorities in Rome.[44]

On June 3, 1857, more support came to the friars in a letter from Archbishop Alemany, written in response to a request for advice in the matter from Father Antonio Jimeno, the superior of the college. The letter served to clarify the problem and indicated some possible alternatives at this point in the controversy.

> "The Illustrious Bishop Amat is well-intentioned, but according to what you write, it appears that in his manner of thinking, he is in error concerning the condition, object, and privileges of that College of Your Reverences and in that frame of mind he is writing to Rome things that can destroy or crush that foundation established by the permission of the bishop and of the Holy See.
>
> "If Your Reverence is persuaded that he has written or is going to write what you indicated to me, my prudence suggests that Your Reverences also write to your superiors of the Order in Rome, sending a simple exposition of all and describing the actual state of the college. Indicate the paucity of priests, the discipline observed and of course, the plan or pressure of Bishop Amat to destroy what has cost so much labor to those who brought the Gospel to California and brought forth the Church in both dioceses.
>
> "If in Rome they desire any information on the case, they can obtain it from my poor person for (as far as my knowledge and power is available) I will do everything possible for the conservation and prosperity of that, your College.
>
> "It is surprising that Bishop Amat thinks as he does on this matter; but I think he is in error. That, however, does not prevent Your Reverences from having recourse in a respectful

> manner. Perhaps you can also ask that the parish or that all the faithful of Santa Barbara remain under the charge of that College, since this was contemplated and it seems to me understood by Your Reverences when the College was founded."[45]

Before concluding, the archbishop urged the friars to propose their resumption of responsibility for the city parish directly to Amat, and he promised to confer with Bishop Amat concerning the entire matter.

On August 12, 1857, Bishop Amat directed two letters to Pope Pius IX indicating his belief that the controversy had escalated to a new level which only drastic action could rectify. He stated that because of his attempts to transfer the Franciscans to San Luis Rey, they had engaged in active warfare against himself and his priests by belittling his authority and turning the people of Santa Barbara against him. The bishop reported that feeling against him ran so high that threats had been made to burn his residence and the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows. Fearing that the friars would cause him trouble wherever they might be stationed in the diocese, the bishop stated that all their special privileges, granted as a result of their constitution as an apostolic college, must be revoked, or he himself would consider leaving the city, along with his diocesan clergy, so the Franciscans could have total jurisdiction in the town. Amat also told the Pope that, since the details of Franciscan abuses were so numerous, he was sending Father Cajetan Sorrentini to Rome with a full report.[46] Once again it seemed patent that Amat's major difficulty lay in his resistance to having a divided ecclesiastical authority, and therefore a divided loyalty among the faithful, in Santa Barbara. But these letters represented a new development in that Amat now laid the burden of the blame for the religious, cultural, and moral turmoil squarely at the door of the Franciscans.

In the meantime, Fathers José González Rubio, Francisco Sánchez, and Antonio Jimeno were struggling to maintain themselves and their students at the apostolic college. In 1856, Bishop Amat had given them $1,000 raised from the tithes collected in Santa Barbara and San Buenaventura to which they were entitled by the terms of the exchange and their return to the mission; but in 1857, no such promised financial aid had been forthcoming from the bishop. Therefore, in September of 1857, Father Jimeno wrote Minister General Montefranco asking that one of the friars be allowed to act as syndic, or treasurer, of the college, since José de la Guerra, the former syndic, had taken ill and no replacement had yet been found. Jimeno also requested that funds for the college be solicited from the Society for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons, France, and that three or four new friars be sent to help staff the college and thus allow the Franciscans to minister to more of the faithful, both Indian and white, in California.[47] Jimeno hoped to raise money by allowing the syndic to oversee the rental of portions of the mission gardens and vineyard. In February of 1858, the superior's request to allow a friar to act in this capacity was granted.[48]

In 1858, accusations concerning the Santa Barbara Franciscans increased. On April 21, 1858, Father Blas Raho, who had been pastor of the parish church in Los Angeles since the summer of 1856, bitterly denounced the friars to officers of Propaganda Fide, complaining that they had turned the ignorant Catholics of Santa Barbara against the bishop and had ignored the discipline which Amat sought to impose. The priest went on to say that the piety of the Catholics in the town was mere superstition and that the hypocrisy of the Franciscans kept them from demanding adherence to the bishop's injunctions for fear they would

lose alms, or contributions, of the people. He pointed indignantly to the poverty of the bishop and concluded by berating the friars for failing to minister to the Indians, stating that the Mexican Franciscans had not carried on the great work of their Spanish predecessors and colleagues in California.[49] On the same day, Amat wrote to Cardinal Alessandro Barnabo, Prefect of Propaganda Fide, that in Santa Barbara the Franciscans were doing nothing while the need for priests among the California Indians was very great, and that the city of Santa Barbara was too small, with only 1400 inhabitants, to support the secular clergy and the Franciscans.[50] During the previous year, in the summer of 1857, Amat himself had moved the cathedral city from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles, both because he correctly felt that the latter city would become the center of Southern California and because of the intensity of the controversy with the Franciscans.[51]

Father Cajetan Sorrentini, whom Bishop Amat had sent to Rome with details of the controversy, had succeeded in giving his testimony there early in 1858. Bernardino de Montefranco, the Franciscan Minister General, advised Father Antonio Jimeno of the charges in March of 1858. On May 2, 1858, Jimeno sent a report back to the Minister General, stating the charges and his responses to them. The superior responded to Sorrentini's four main accusations in the following manner:

> "1) You say: 'There are dissensions between you and the bishop of that diocese.' Up to now, by the grace of God, we have not caused these dissensions. Our obedience and submission is public and well-known. Likewise we have sacrificed our field of labor to please the bishop.
>
> "2) It is stated: 'We follow the laxer opinions in moral theology and that we absolve those who are unworthy and who live in voluntary proximate occasion of sin.' Thus, indeed, perhaps our detractor dreamt in order to calumniate and detract us. We have God as our witness that we

> practice just the contrary. It has always been our practice to teach the doctrines of select authors such as St. Alphonsus Ligouri, the Salmanticenses, Lacroix and others. Nor have we departed from the norms established nor the doctrine approved by the Catholic Church, because we fear the judgement of God, nor do we wish to be included in the condemnation of depraved priests.
>
> "3) It is asserted: 'Both in regard to the faithful and the pagans, we fail to develope that mission.' Because of the lack of missionaries during these late years, we have not been able to give missions among the faithful as in other times. However, when the bishop desires one of us to accompany him on his pastoral visitations, we do so and we preach in the places we visit... Preaching to the pagans, far removed from here, could not be accomplished because of the same lack of missionaries.
>
> "4) Finally we are told: 'We not only lead an idle life but we teach the people superstitions.' Everyday we are occupied in choir, in the church, in study, and in other spiritual exercises, from a quarter past four in the morning until nine at night. At the proper time, we preach, hear confessions, when there are penitents; the sick we frequently visit and we administer the sacraments to the Indians of the mission..."[52]

Father Jimeno closed the letter by adverting to the circumstances in which the original charges and accusations had been brought against the friars and the role of Father Sorrentini in the genesis of dissension.

> Allow me to expose what is just for the honor and defense of our college. When a certain ecclesiastic was in this city for several months (who according to report is now in Rome) he showed us an unprovoked antipathy, which was known even by quite a few secular persons. While he was here we had such sorrows to bear that we never experienced the like before or since.[53]

On March 19, 1858, Archbishop Alemany added his voice to the defense of the Santa Barbara Franciscans in a letter to Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of Propaganda Fide, in which he praised both Fathers Sánchez and González Rubio

XUM

for their devotion, zeal, and good reputation in California. The archbishop gave special attention to González Rubio's contribution to Catholicism in the state by reviewing the history of his work from his missionary days, through the episcopacy of Francisco García Diego and his years as administrator of the mitre, to his work as vicar general in the Diocese of Monterey and the Archdiocese of San Francisco.[54] In June of 1858, Alemany gave further support to the friars in a letter to the Franciscan Minister General in which he described them as "truly apostolic men who love prayerful silence, poverty, the Church, and the laws of the Church which they observe rigorously."[55] The archbishop went on to single out González Rubio for special praise, stating that he was "the most venerated man in all of California for his knowledge, prudence, and virtue."[56] Alemany closed by suggesting that a canonical visitor be appointed to investigate the controversy at first hand, and he offered to appoint a Jesuit from his archdiocese to fill this office. Six days later, on June 9, 1858, Alemany sent a letter to González Rubio assuring him that if his testimony were needed in an official investigation he would gladly witness to the "zeal and apostolic labors" of the Santa Barbara Franciscans in California.[57]

The conflicting reports of the controversy had become so confusing by the winter of 1858 that the Franciscan Minister General, on March 9, appointed Father Francisco Caro, a Franciscan priest then serving at St. Joseph's Church in Rossville, Staten Island, New York, as apostolic visitor. The Minister General wrote Caro that Bishop Amat had accused the Santa Barbara friars of being proud, undisciplined, ignorant, lazy, and superstitious, and urged the priest to use all his wisdom and prudence in examening the conduct of each side toward the other.[58] In another letter, dated May 10, 1858, the Minister General asked Caro to investigate both the disciplinary and economic aspects of the situation

XUM

and said he hoped to see reports which would lead to a rebirth of Franciscan ministry in California.[59] On June 19, 1858, Caro left New York for San Francisco and González Rubio, on Caro's request, journeyed to San Francisco to meet him.[60] Bishop Amat also went to San Francisco for preliminary talks with Caro, but before his arrival the apostolic visitor spent time alone there with Alemany and González Rubio. During this time Caro became convinced of the friars' innocence. He reported his initial reaction to Minister General Montefranco stating that not only Alemany and González Rubio, but everyone he questioned, testified to the good reputation of the friars. He described González Rubio as a man "not only well-versed, but profoundly so, in theology, canon law, and everything necessary to constitute an educated man," and he closed by stating his fear that the bishop had put too much credence in the word of Father Cajetan Sorrentini whom he called "indolent, ambitious, and fanatical."[61]

On August 26, 1858, Fathers Caro and González Rubio, along with Bishop Amat, arrived in Santa Barbara. Three days later, on August 29, González Rubio was appointed president of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, which office he officially assumed on September 11.[62] During the first two weeks of September the apostolic visitor set about his investigation of the controversy by interrogating the friars concerning their management of the apostolic college and by questioning many of the townspeople concerning the behavior and reputation of the Franciscans. Father Francisco Sánchez, the master of novices, provided Caro with a description of the daily activities at the college.

> "The daily schedule at the apostolic college was as follows: The friars rose at 4:15 A.M. and made an hour's meditation starting at 4:30. This was followed by the chanting of Prime and Tierce whereupon the priests said their Masses. Breakfast

was at 7. The time between 7:30 and 9 was spent in study, class following from 9 until 10. Sext and None were then chanted and at 10:30, another period of study as well as practice in ecclesiastical chant followed.

"The noonday meal was at 11:30 followed by a free period until 1 o'clock. Silence was observed from 1 until 2 which was followed by Vespers. Next, there was a class, the recitation of the Rosary (except on Saturdays and Sundays) and a study period until 4. Another class was held from 4 to 5 followed by a half hour of recreation. At 5:30 Matins were chanted followed by a half hour of meditation which was dispensed with on certain feast days. Supper was served at 7 followed by a brief free period. At 8:15 the Stations were said, the Tota Pulchra sung, examination of conscience made and at stated times, the discipline taken. After that the friars retired."[63]

On September 6, 1858, Antonio de la Palma y Mesa, Justice of the Peace and Judge of the Second District Court of Santa Barbara County, testified to Caro that the friars had carried out their ministry in accordance with the highest principles and given good example to all classes of Santa Barbara citizens. He further stated that they never spoke against the dignity or person of Bishop Amat or any of the secular clergy.[64] On the same day, Antonio María de la Guerra, President of the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors, recalled the love and respect of all the townspeople, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, for González Rubio, which feelings had caused them to frustrate his departure for Mexico in 1856. He continued to say that Father Cajetan Sorrentini had approached him with the rumor that the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows would be burned if the Franciscans were forced to leave Santa Barbara, stating that he himself had attempted to calm the priest's unfounded fears. He closed his testimony by narrating Bishop Amat's threats to use his power to transfer the Franciscans to San Luis Rey if the friars would not co-operate voluntarily with the transfer.[65]

Joaquín Carrillo, Judge of the Second District Court of Santa Barbara County, and Guillermo Carrillo, mayor of Santa Barbara, both testified on September 8, 1858, that the Franciscans had given nothing but good example and devoted service to the citizens of the city in their preaching, teaching, and counseling. They added that they had never heard the friars speak a negative or disparaging word against Bishop Amat or the diocesan clergy.[66] On the same day, a testimonial in favor of the friars was signed by fifty-four citizens of Santa Barbara, the majority of whom had Spanish surnames although some Anglo-Americans also signed, stating that the Franciscans led lives which were "apostolic, diligent, continent, charitable, and religious."[67]

On the following day, September 9, 1858, Pablo de la Guerra, California state senator and President of the Santa Barbara City Council, gave a lengthy testimonial which explored many of the nuances of the controversy.[68] Regarding the reputation which Franciscanism enjoyed in California, De la Guerra stated that the friars

> have carried out their apostolic mission in such a manner among the pagans and Catholics and their personal conduct has been so pure and conformable to their sacred ministry that they have won for themselves permanently the esteem and religious veneration of the entire old population of California.69

He went on to speak specifically of the three friars then living at the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Fathers Antonio Jimeno, Francisco Sánchez, and José González Rubio, insisting that

> they have lived and are living a life entirely cloistered and monastic, dedicating themselves to prayer, study, corporal work and the assistance to the sick who frequently seek their help. I know and certify that Franciscan poverty among them is not merely nominal but real and positive for at various times I ate casually with them and their refectory is indeed a true place of abstinence.70

XUM

De la Guerra then adverted to the discord which had emerged between the bishop and the friars and the role he had attempted to play as mediator between them. Speaking of the Franciscans' behavior in the negotiations he stated:

> I never heard from one of them a single word which in any way would becloud or injure the high respect due to the bishop nor against his person nor against the respect due to the secular clergy; but on the contrary they always tried to free the bishop and the secular clergy from blame, attributing the existing difficulties only to the adverse reports made by a few persons. Their charitable self-denial in the matter of their own defense has always been for me a source of edification and a corroboration of the ideal I always held of them.71

Next, De la Guerra turned to a consideration of Bishop Amat's attitude toward the Franciscans, testifying that the bishop had opined that the Franciscan Order was "no longer useful in our times in this country for its most ancient institution did not accommodate itself to the present age."[72] De la Guerra had asked the bishop how the Santa Barbara citizens could so easily be expected to switch their loyalties from the Franciscans, who had shared the turmoil of transitional California with them, to the more recently arrived clergy whom he described as "avaricious even to the point of stealing in order to obtain wealth." To this the bishop replied emotionally: "Don Pablo, Don Pablo, the older priests [i.e. the Franciscans] robbed still more."[73] Such dialogue pointed once again to the difficult cultural and religious transition from a missionary clergy, dependent upon government aid, the produce of the missions, and voluntary contributions, to a diocesan clergy which insisted upon the enforcement of obligatory donations for the support of the Church.

XUM

The bishop's attitudes, however, convinced De la Guerra that the prelate had been turned against the Franciscans by some other person, rather than by the objective facts of the situation. He intimated who this person might be by reporting that Father Cajetan Sorrentini, during his initial investigation of the controversy, had told him that he had previously been appointed by Pope Pius IX to investigate alleged bad conduct on the part of Franciscans in Palestine. The priest had continued that, after he discovered possible links between the Franciscans and the Masons there and after the friars learned the real purpose of his investigatory mission, the Franciscans had tried to kill him.[74] In spite of the bishop's attentiveness to what De la Guerra considered blatantly prejudicial hearsay, he still described Amat as "a just man, hardworking and active, and a bishop zealous in the fulfillment of his episcopal duties."[75]

On September 9, 1858, Caro officially concluded his interrogation of witnesses and closed his investigation. On that day, González Rubio, the new president of the apostolic college, addressed letters both to Caro and to Minister General Montefranco thanking the former for his work in carrying out the visitation and the latter for drawing up the original order for its execution.[76] Father Caro wrote González Rubio from San Francisco just prior to his departure from California, on September 18, 1858, that the friars should continue in their work and trust him to bring about a fair settlement.[77] In all this correspondence there was a definite mood of relief and hope that the controversy would soon be settled. But such expectations were to prove premature.

On September 10, 1858, after Caro's investigation was completed, Bishop Amat wrote to Cardinal Barnabò that Caro "certainly had not fulfilled his assignment and matters in Santa Barbara were worse than they had been before the investigation."[78] Two weeks later, on September 24, 1858,

XUM

the bishop once again wrote to Barnabo giving his version of the flagrant miscarriage of justice which Caro had perpetrated in his investigation.[79] Amat stated that Caro had "unworthily and villainously" represented his Minister General and that he had wished only to uphold the innocence of the Franciscans in the affair. The bishop reported that when he himself had met with Caro, Alemany, and González Rubio in San Francisco, a tentative agreement had been approved to reinstate the Santa Barbara friars in the parish of Our Lady of Sorrows provided they fully adhered to diocesan policies and regulations; but, the subsequent indiscretion and prejudicial methods which Caro had used in the investigation had caused Amat to reverse this decision.

Amat specifically charged that Caro had allowed himself to be swayed by anonymous letters attacking both himself and Father Cajetan Sorrentini, that the visitor had promised to keep the investigation out of the public arena, but instead had made it a public spectacle, and that he had coerced many of the townspeople of Santa Barbara into testifying in favor of the friars. The bishop informed Barnabò that the friars themselves had engaged in coercion to cajole a great number of citizens into signing attestations in their behalf and he launched into a moral denunciation of some of the prominent citizens who had aligned themselves with the Franciscans. He said that matters had become so bad he had had to send for Archbishop Alemany who had come quickly to Santa Barbara and that Caro had persisted in swearing, in the presence of the archbishop, that he had not coerced witnesses until he was confronted with the witnesses themselves. It was only at that point that he had confessed to the charges. But then, Amat reported, Caro had drawn up another attestation which the most corrupt people in Santa Barbara signed. The bishop concluded his report to Barnabò in these words: "Therefore, I told Archbishop Alemany, and now I tell you, Most Eminent Prince,

with the greatest reverence, that these Religious must leave this place; and if this is not effected, I myself will leave to place my episcopacy at the feet of His Holiness."[80]

On the same day, September 24, 1858, Bishop Amat sent separate correspondence to Cardinal Barnabò explicitly for the purpose of defending Father Cajetan Sorrentini who had carried the initial report of the controversy to Rome. This letter cast light on some of the personality conflicts involved in the case. The bishop stated that he was certain that Sorrentini had adversaries who were defaming him, but that these people were enemies of religion.[81] He continued that Sorrentini had done so much good in Monterey that people had sought to slander him, specifically by spreading nebulous gossip about his involvement with an unnamed woman. But, according to Amat, such gossip could not alter the fact that Sorrentini was a good priest whose growing popularity among the Santa Barbara Catholics had occasioned the jealousy of the Franciscans there. The bishop argued that Sorrentini must be excused if he had been too zealous in his criticism of the friars since they had accorded the same treatment to him.[82]

In a second letter to Barnabò bearing the same date, September 24, 1858, more details of Sorrentini's activities and relationships were discussed by Bishop Amat.[83] The content of this letter has been accurately summarized in these words:

> Sorrentini had a few enemies, the bishop said, but they were "enemies of religion." There were two seminarians who were expelled from the seminary in Santa Barbara who thought Sorrentini was the cause of their expulsion. Also on two occasions Sorrentini had imprudently said something about two priests, not Franciscans, which was true but which happened to get back to the priests accused.[84]

Once again, the bishop sought to excuse Sorrentini for his anti-Franciscan statements stating that it was difficult "to restrain oneself in the present circumstances, especially

when the truth and the good of religion seemed to demand it."[85]

On the same day, September 24, 1858, members of the diocesan clergy who had come to California in the service of Bishop Amat joined in defending the prelate and the diocesan administration by directing correspondence to Rome. The letter signed by Fathers Cypriano Rubio of Santa Inés, Jayme Vila of Santa Barbara, and Michele Racca of Santa Barbara concerned itself primarily with the high level of corruption and immorality among the upper class Catholics of Santa Barbara who served as a bad example to the rest of the populace.[86] The priests stated that the bishop and the diocesan clergy had attempted to clarify the Church's disapproval of such behavior, but that the friars had effectively frustrated the attempt by continuing to minister to the guilty parties, by being lax in the confessional and the pulpit, and by failing to adequately support the moral reform which the bishop sought to motivate.

In another letter bearing the same date, September 24, 1858, these three priests were joined by Fathers Blas Raho of Los Angeles, Dominic Serrano of San Gabriel, and Vicente Llover of San Buenaventura in disclaiming the Franciscan resistance to Amat's attempts at moral reform directly to the Pope.[87] They claimed that the friars fostered a nominal and superstitious Christianity which scandalized the American Protestants with its shameful version of Catholicism. Amat's attempts at reform caused an organized resistance on the part of the leading families of Santa Barbara who allied themselves with the Franciscans in waging a war against the bishop. The friars, by feigning both humility and ignorance, continued to foster superstitious practices and to display a lax attitude in administering the sacraments to public sinners and untutored children in opposition to diocesan restrictions. The priests concluded by stating that a continuation of this situation could cause the bishop to totally withdraw the diocesan clergy from Santa Barbara.

XUM

On September 30, 1858, Cardinal Barnabò wrote Amat stating that from the information then in Rome the Franciscans were innocent of the accusations which Sorrentini had leveled against them and that the bishop would do well to gather more facts or "be accused of believing too easily other sources of information."[88] But Bishop Amat had already decided to take the case to Rome personally and to take severe measures against the Santa Barbara Franciscans until the case was settled. Accordingly, on September 24, 1858, the bishop asked González Rubio to resign as his vicar general because he believed that office to be incompatible with his new office as president of the apostolic college; and, in a second letter, the bishop revoked the diocesan faculties of all three of the Franciscan priests at Santa Barbara.[89] This revocation of faculties meant, in essence, that the friars could no longer minister publicly in the diocese. The news came as an unexpected blow to the friars who did not receive it until after Amat had departed for Europe. González Rubio, expressing his amazement at the bishop's decision in a letter to Father Francisco Caro, said that the friars would comply with the order and say Mass only in private, but he added that the good reputation of Father Sánchez extended over the entire diocese and that only Father Antonio Jimeno was capable of hearing the confessions of the old Indians since he alone could understand their language.[90] In October, Archbishop Alemany concurred with González Rubio's judgement regarding the friars' right to say private Masses and admonished them to refrain from public preaching or hearing confessions. Finally, the archbishop counseled patience until word came from Rome regarding the entire affair.[91]

In late 1858 the center of the controversy shifted from Santa Barbara to Rome as Caro, the apostolic visitor, and Bishop Amat journeyed there to present their respective cases.[92] Before leaving New York, Caro wrote ahead to

Father Montefranco, the Franciscan Minister General, that Amat's initial charges against the friars were erroneously founded not on fact, but on the biased statements of Sorrentini, and that he found the people of Santa Barbara of all classes sympathetic to the Franciscans. He spoke of González Rubio as "regarded by all, Protestants and Catholics, newcomers and natives, with the highest esteem and veneration."[93] In Rome, Caro continued to summarize his case, both to the Franciscan Minister General and the officers of Propaganda Fide, by denying and rebutting Amat's charges concerning the friars and defending his own method of executing the visitation.[94]

Caro's notes, gathered in the fall of 1858 to aid him in presenting his case in Rome, dwelt at length on the alleged shortcomings and dubious reputation of Father Cajetan Sorrentini in the hope of destroying the credibility of Amat's primary source of information. The visitor assembled a host of charges against the priest, ranging from scandals arising from incontinence and intemperance to hatred of the Franciscans and jealousy of their popularity. In addition, Caro stated that Sorrentini had engaged in conscious intrigue by attempting to intimidate Bishop Amat with information about the prelate's initial reluctance to accept the mitre of Monterey. Sorrentini was described as pompous and arrogant, and Caro asserted that his sexual indiscretion had caused him to be burned in effigy in Monterey and to be driven out of that city.[95]

In the meantime, officials of both Propaganda Fide and the Franciscan Curia in Rome spent the last days of 1858 in an effort to settle the controversy. They set about gathering and sifting all the available facts, testimonials, and the character evaluations of principals in the case, most especially the record of Father Sorrentini.[96] In December, Father Montefranco wrote to Cardinal Cajetan Bedini,

XUM

Secretary of Propaganda Fide, to clarify the charges of fomenting superstition which Amat had lodged against the friars by pointing to the distinction between superstitious practices and authentic devotional activity. Among the latter the Minister General included the indulgences which the friars granted, not according to their whim, but according to the forms and stipulations set down by papal teaching. He felt that Amat's attitude in making such charges was petty, since he had been prejudiced by biased hearsay against the Franciscans.[97] On December 28, 1858, a hearing was scheduled at Propaganda Fide for all interested parties, including Bishop Amat who had arrived in Rome, but no resolution resulted.[98]

At the end of 1858, with the litigation regarding their status and their future being carried on in Rome, the three friars at the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows in Santa Barbara ceased to minister publicly because their faculties had been revoked by Bishop Amat. This was the first interruption in the ministry of Franciscans in Santa Barbara since the mission had been founded in 1786. González Rubio had personal doubts about the legal validity of the bishop's revocation of the friars' faculties. They were based on his belief that Amat had failed to give the necessary explanation of the specific causes for his action. Nevertheless, the friar agreed to comply with the bishop's decision.[99] On December 1, 1858, Archbishop Alemany approved González Rubio's compliance with the suspension, stating that it was the safest and most prudent course to take while the case was being resolved in Rome.[100]

The larger context for the dispute between the Santa Barbara Franciscans and Bishop Amat was the racial and cultural tension, as well as the proliferation of vigilante justice, which pervaded Southern California in the 1850's. These problems had reached monumental proportions in Los Angeles by the time Bishop Amat had arrived late in 1855.[101]

XUM

In the years between 1856 and 1860, when the Franciscan controversy arose, retaliatory violence on the part of the Spanish-speaking had become a fact of life in and around Santa Barbara where the polarity between the Anglo-Americans and the Hispanic-Americans, who were still well in the majority numerically, continued to increase. A cycle of violence was set in motion as Yankee citizens applied the techniques of vigilante law and order to offset the reluctance of predominantly Spanish-speaking juries and magistrates to convict their countrymen of crimes because of their understanding of the turmoil and sense of oppression which had generated these crimes.[102]

Bishop Amat was genuinely alarmed and distressed at this chaotic situation, but his initial comdemnation of the behavior of California Catholics and the subsequent moral denunciations of them by the secular clergy expressed no awareness of the upheaval which these people had been undergoing before the bishop and clergy had arrived in the diocese. At the same time, the bishop and his clergy, instead of allocating blame to this social and cultural turmoil, came to hold the Franciscans as responsible.[103] The fact that Pablo de la Guerra could speak so highly of Bishop Amat in the midst of Caro's investigation and his testimony that the Franciscans never verbally attacked the bishop or his clergy was a witness to their belief in Amat's sincerity. Yet this sincerity did not render the bishop capable of separating the social, cultural, and racial tensions from the theological and religious ones. In addition, the alleged indiscretions of both Sorrentini's report and Caro's investigation destroyed the hopes for a compromise settlement.

XUM

NOTES

CHAPTER VII

[1]The nature and function of these institutions have been treated in chap. i above. cf. Saiz Diez, Los Colegios de Propaganda Fide.

[2]Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, pp. 327-328.

[3]Alemany to Pius IX, Monterey, November 4, 1851, PAR, vol. 115. Alemany to Propaganda Fide, Monterey, November 4, 1851, PAR, vol. 115.

[4]Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 330. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 700.

[5]These notations appear in the margins of the letters cited in note 3 above.

[6]DeRignano to Barnabò, Rome, February 21, 1852, PAR, vol. 115.

[7]Barnabò to Pius IX, Rome, February 29, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 701. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 330. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:2 (October, 1948), 55.

[8]De Rignano to Alemany, Rome, April 1, 1852, SBMA. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, pp. 330-331. The best study of the Franciscan missionary college at Santa Barbara is contained in a series of articles by Maynard Geiger, "The Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Santa Barbara, California(1853-1885)" which appeared in Provincial Annals at irregular intervals from XI:2 (October, 1948) to XIX:3 (January, 1957).

[9]Alemany to Orruño, Santa Barbara, January 6, 1853, SBMA. Decree of establishment of hospice, Santa Barbara, January 7, 1853, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., pp. 323-333. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 703. Geiger, op. cit., p. 57.

[10]Alemany to J.J. Jimeno, San Francisco, April 18, 1853, SBMA. Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 704-705. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 334.

[11]J.J. Jimeno to Franciscan Minister General, Mission Santa Barbara, February 1, 1854, SBMA.

[12]Alemany to Fransoni, San Francisco, March 31, 1854, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 62.

XUM

[13]Fransoni to Alemany, Rome, May 29, 1854, SBMA. Geiger, loc. cit..

[14]J.J. Jimeno and Sánchez to González Rubio, San Francisco, April 27, 1854, SBMA. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 335. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 155.

[15]Aguirre to J. de la Guerra, San Diego, March 1, 1854, SBMA. Aguirre to J. de la Guerra, San Diego, March 23, 1854, SBMA.

[16]Geiger, loc. cit..

[17]Ibid., p. 156. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 336.

[18]Rome, May 28, 1854, PAR, vol. 24. Pope Pius VI, in the bull Decet Romanum Pontificem, December 12, 1797, centralized the ruling authority of the apostolic colleges in the officers of each college, rather than in the Commissary General of the Indies, which office had been suppressed in 1768. cf. Saiz Diez, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

[19]Santa Barbara, July 23, 1854, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., pp. 336-339.

[20]For the application records of these candidates cf. docs. 10-18, 68, Documents of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, SBMA.

[21]Engelhardt, Missions and Missionaries, IV, 707. Geiger, loc. cit..

[22]Alemany to J.J. Jimeno, San José, July 28, 1854, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:3 (January, 1949), 109. Alemany's enthusiastic support of the Franciscans in this matter, based no doubt on his tremendous respect for their missionary contribution to California, stood in ironic contrast to the difficulties he had with the Dominicans (his own order!) and the Jesuits in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. cf. McGloin, California's First Archbishop, pp. 159, 199-226, 253-276.

[23]Geiger, op. cit., p. 106.

[24]Ibid..

[25]Docs. 41b, 41c, Documents of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, SBMA.

XUM

[26]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 157. cf. Inventory of articles belonging to Our Lady of Sorrows Church, Santa Barbara, August, 1855, SBMA.

[27]Ibid..

[28]The bishop received permission to change the cathedral city of the Diocese of Monterey from Monterey to Santa Barbara due to the more central location of the latter town. cf. Geiger, op. cit., p. 162.

[29]Geiger, op. cit., pp. 162-163. Weber, California's Reluctant Prelate, pp. 52-53.

[30]Geiger, op. cit., p. 163. Weber, op. cit., p. 52.

[31]Amat to Fransoni, Santa Barbara, April 2, 1856, PAR, vol. 17. Pius IX to Amat, Rome, July 6, 1856, SBMA. Geiger, loc. cit..

[32]Rome, post July 6, 1856, PAR, vol. 985. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XI:3 (January, 1949), 112. Weber describes the terms of this exchange as "an arrangement that would not seem to have been an adequate quid pro quo." Weber, op. cit., p. 52, note 2.

[33]González Rubio to Pius IX, Mission Santa Barbara, October 24, 1856, PAR, vol. 124. Pius IX to the Franciscans of Santa Barbara, Rome, December 20, 1856, SBMA. Geiger, loc. cit..

[34]Pitt, The Decline of the Californios, pp. 48-68.

[35]Bean, California, p. 157. For a treatment of specific land title cases involving the Spanish-speaking cf. Pi[illegible], op. cit., pp. 83-119.

[36]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 169. For a good summary of these years in Santa Barbara cf. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 168-173.

[37]Ibid., p. 170.

[38]Ibid., p. 171.

[39]Amat, Exhortación Pastoral, September 16, 1856, SBMA. cf. Weber, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

[40]Weber, op. cit., p. 53.

[41]Rome, post July 23, 1854, PAR, vol. 24. This document contains a notation by officials of Propaganda Fide which states that Amat's basic contention in his controversy with the Santa Barbara Franciscans was his belief that two ecclesiastical authorities were incompatible in the same location.

[42]Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, October 11, 1856, PAR, vol. 17. Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, October 25, 1856, PAR, vol. 17. Weber, op. cit., p. 55.

[43]Montefranco to Propaganda Fide, Rome, January 3, 1857, PAR, vol. 17.

[44]Covarrubias to A. Jimeno, Mexico City, May 22, 1857, SBMA.

[45]Alemany to A. Jimeno, San Francisco, June 3, 1857, SBMA. This translation is found in Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:1 (July, 1949), 1-5.

[46]Amat to Pius IX, Santa Barbara, August 12, 1857, PAR, vol. 985. Amat to Pius IX, Santa Barbara, August 12, 1857, PAR, vol. 985. In 1854, Sorrentini, a member of the Roman clergy, joined Amat in coming to California. cf. Weber, op. cit., p. 56, note 14.

[47]Jimeno to Montefranco, Mission Santa Barbara, September 3, 1857, SBMA. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, pp. 163-164.

[48]Rome, February 4, 1858, SBMA. Franciscans, because of their vow of poverty, were not allowed to handle their community finances. A layman was normally appointed for this task. At this time, Jose de la Guerra, who had been the friars' syndic, became ill and died on February 11, 1858. cf. Thompson, El Gran Capitan, pp. 139-150. Hence, Jimeno had to seek special permission for a friar to fill the post until another layman could be recruited. On February 15, 1859, Pablo de la Guerra was appointed to the position. cf. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 169.

[49]Raho to Propaganda Fide, Los Angeles, April 21, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[50]Amat to Barnabò, Los Angeles, April 21, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[51]Weber, op. cit., p. 45.

[52]A. Jimeno to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, May 2, 1858, SBMA. This translation is found in Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:1 (July, 1949), 7-10.

[53]Ibid. The "certain ecclesiastic" was Father Cajetan Sorrentini who had lodged the charges against the friars in Rome.

[54]Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, March 19, 1858, PAR, vol. 18.

[55]Alemany to Montefranco, San Francisco, June 3, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Alemany to González Rubio, Placerville, June 9, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 10.

[58]Montefranco to Caro, Rome, March 9, 1858, FCR.

[59]Montefranco to Caro, Rome, May 10, 1858, FCR.

[60]Caro to González Rubio, New York, June 5, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:2 (October, 1949), 47. For a description of Caro's departure from his Staten Island parish cf. The Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register (New York), July 10, 1858.

[61]Caro to Montefranco, San Francisco, August 4, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[62]Santa Barbara Gazette, August 26, 1858. Caro to Gonzaléz Rubio, Santa Barbara, August 29, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 164.

[63]Sánchez, daily schedule, Santa Barbara, September, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. This summary is found in Geiger, Misión Santa Barbara, pp. 164-165.

[64]Antonio de la Palma y Mesa, Santa Barbara, September 6, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[65]Antonio María de la Guerra, Santa Barbara, September 6, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[66]Joaquín Carrillo, Santa Barbara, September 8, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Guillermo Carrillo, Santa Barbara, September 8, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[67]Testimonial, Santa Barbara, September 8, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Geiger, op. cit., p. 175.

[68]Pablo de la Guerra, Santa Barbara, September 9, 1858, PAR, vol. 5.

[69]Ibid. Translations of these excerpts of De la Guerra's testimony may be found in Geiger, op. cit., pp. 177-178.

[70]Ibid.

[71]Ibid.

[72]Ibid.

[73]Ibid.

[74]In regard to these allegations and Sorrentini's resultant anti-Franciscanism, Weber states that "in later years Sorrentini displayed an openly hostile attitude toward anything Franciscan and may well have been the driving force behind the whole Amat-Franciscan controversy." Weber, op. cit., p. 56, note 14.

[75]For the full collection of the pro-Franciscan testimony gathered by Francisco Caro cf. Expediente, Santa Barbara, September 10, 1858, FCR.

[76]González Rubio to Caro, Santa Barbara, September 9, 1858, PAR, vol. 5. González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, September 9, 1858, PAR, vol. 5.

[77]Caro to González Rubio, San Francisco, September 18, 1858, SBMA.

[78]Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, September 10, 1858, PAR, vol. 18. Weber writes that Bishop Amat "was furious with the findings of the Caro report when he read them." Weber, op. cit., p. 58.

[79]Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Weber, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[80]Ibid.

[81]Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, SBMA.

[82]Cf. Sorrentini to Cazora, Monterey, April 1, 1856, PAR, vol. 985. Sorrentini to Cazora, Santa Barbara, December 21, 1856, PAR, vol. 985. In the first of these

letters, Sorrentini spoke of a woman who was ill and for whom he was very solicitous. In the second, the priest reflected on the ignorance of the California populace and stated that perhaps one day he would be appreciated by the simple people of Monterey. He closed with the thought that he had accomplished more in six months than the saints would know how to do in long years. Such statements are piecemeal and inconclusive. What is significant is that they found their way to the Propaganda Fide archives and, therefore, could well have been a part of the overall evaluation given to Sorrentini's testimony by Propaganda Fide.

[83]Amat to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[84]These translated excerpts and a summary of this letter may be found in Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:2 (October, 1949), 49.

[85]Ibid.

[86]Rubio, Vila, Racca to Barnabò, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 176.

[87]Raho, Serrano, Rubio, Vila, Llover, Racca to Pius IX, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[88]Barnabò to Amat, Rome, September 30, 1858, AALA.

[89]Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, SBMA. Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, September 24, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:2 (October, 1949), 52.

[90]González Rubio to Caro, Santa Barbara, October 4, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[91]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, October 17, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 163.

[92]It is probable that Amat and Caro coincidentally booked passage on the same ship from New York to Europe. cf. Caro to Santa Barbara Franciscans, New York, October 29, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:2 (October, 1949), 50.

[93]Caro to Montefranco, New York, October 25, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

XUM

[94]Caro to Barnabò, Rome, December 6, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Caro to Montefranco, Rome, December 17, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[95]Caro, notes, Rome, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[96]Franciscan Curia, notes, Rome, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Propaganda Fide, notes, Rome, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[97]Montefranco to Bedini, Rome, December 27, 1858, PAR, vol. 985. Montefranco referred to the teachings of Popes Clement IV, Nicolas III, and Leo X regarding indulgences, stating that the Santa Barbara friars had not departed from these norms. An indulgence is "a promise of the Church's special intercession with God for remission of the temporal punishment due to sins the guilt of which has already been wiped out" in return for the recitation of certain prayers or the performance of good works and at least a general intention of gaining the indulgence, the details of which are specified by the Church. cf. Rahner and Vorgrimler, Theological Dictionary, p. 227.

[98]Cf. Montefranco to Bedini, Rome, December 16, 1858, PAR, vol. 18. Propaganda Fide to Montefranco, Rome, December 20, 1858, FCR. Montefranco to Propaganda Fide, Rome, December 23, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[99]González Rubio to Caro, Santa Barbara, October 4, 1858, PAR, vol. 985.

[100]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, December 1, 1858, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 164.

[101]Cf. Pitt, op. cit., pp. 148-166. Pitt gives some of the details of racial violence and vigilante justice in Los Angeles in this period.

[102]For details of crime, punishment, and vigilante activity in these years in and around Santa Barbara cf. ibid., pp. 174-180.

[103]It is interesting to note that the letters of the diocesan clergy concerning the lawlessness and immorality of the Spanish-speaking Catholics of Santa Barbara, and Franciscan complicity in their behavior, make no adequate appraisal of the racial and cultural violence and counterviolence in other parts of Southern California.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONTROVERSY IN ROME (1859-1861)

At the beginning of 1859 Rome became the setting for the litigation between Bishop Amat and the Santa Barbara Franciscans. The friars themselves remained in California, suspended from involvement in public ministry, while Francisco Caro, Bishop Amat, Minister General Montefranco, Cardinals Barnabò and Bedini, Prefect and Secretary of Propaganda Fide respectively, and ultimately even Pope Pius IX engaged in negotiations ans study to reach a suitable resolution in the matter. On January 5, 1859, Bishop Amat once again entered a plea that the friars move their college and novitiate to San Luis Rey in order to minister to the Indians there. He also repeated his basic contention that Santa Barbara could not financially support both the diocesan clergy and the Franciscans. In addition, the bishop pointed out the beauty and healthfulness of the San Luis Rey region, promising to provide financial support for the friars by donating a farm stocked with sheep and cattle for their sustenance.[1] Minister General Montefranco's initial plea of January 15, 1859, on the other hand, stressed the good work of the friars and the injustice of the revocation of their faculties, asking that their jurisdiction be restored.[2] At this point Amat's argumentation changed in both tone and content. He railed against the reported immorality of certain Mexican Franciscans, who had since left California, and stated that all the merit for good missionary activity in early California must go to the Spanish, not Mexican, Franciscans.[3]

In the meantime the pressure of the controversy manifested itself in Santa Barbara when, at the end of

January, 1859, Father Antonio Jimeno, exercising his right according to the constitutions of the College of San Fernando from which he had come, chose to leave California and return to Mexico. One writer indicated Jimeno's motivations for departing when he said that "doubtless the treatment he had received at the hands of Amat caused him to do so."[4] Jimeno's departure left only two Franciscan priests in Santa Barbara, José González Rubio and Francisco Sánchez. In essence, the status of these two priests, as symbols of the future of Franciscanism in California, was the object of the continuing litigation in Rome. In February and March of 1859, Archbishop Alemany informed González Rubio that the evidence was under consideration in Rome, that Montefranco was being consistent in their defense, and that his own reports were being included in the friars' case.[5]

On February 25, 1859, Bishop Amat and Minister General Montefranco met personally with Cardinal Barnabò.[6] The bishop suggested three possible solutions to the dispute: that the friars move to San Luis Rey; that another apostolic visitor be appointed if both parties agreed to abide by his decision; that the Franciscans leave California. But no accord on these proposals was reached. Accordingly, on March 3, 1859, Bishop Amat, after reporting the conference and the stalemate, addressed a lengthy manifesto directly to Pope Pius IX stating the details of his position in the hope of securing the Pope's favorable judgement.[7] Amat first referred to his initial report of the reasons for his revocation of the friars' faculties. These reasons have been summarized in the following words:

> The bishop's grievances embraced the following points: 1) The friars were admitting youngsters to Holy Communion without any instructions whatsoever; 2) All types of public sinners were being given the sacraments, even those known to be burglars, thieves, etc.; 3) There had been a widespread dissipation of Church goods to those unworthy of such; 4) The first bishop, Francisco García Diego y Moreno, had been shamefully treated

by the friars during his residence at the mission in Santa Barbara; 5) Calumnies had been directed toward the bishop and his curia; 6) The friars had been unreceptive of all correction on the part of the bishop; 7) False indulgences were being granted; 8) The friars refused to care for the needy Indians; 9) The friars had been begging in the diocese without the proper ecclesiastical permission; 10) Finally, they had waged a systematic warfare between themselves and the bishop.[8]

After this presentation of charges, Bishop Amat proceeded to relate his personal reflections on the case to the Pope, stating that his first choice was to have the friars depart from the diocese completely, although he would bow to the Pope's wishes if he decided only to transfer them to San Luis Rey. He said he would risk making a mistake in upholding the revocation of the faculties, but he could not in conscience allow the friars to hear confessions. He stated that he had given both Fathers Sánchez and González Rubio adequate warning of the suspension in the hope that they would co-operate with him and that he had conferred with several diocesan priests before deciding on the suspension.[9] The bishop adverted to the scandal that the Franciscans had caused to good Catholics by their laxity in preaching and administering the sacraments, stating that they had occasioned a virtual schism in Santa Barbara, in which the good Catholics supported the diocesan administration against the friars. In addition, Amat stated that he himself was the best judge of the circumstances and, therefore, did not want another apostolic visitor appointed to investigate, especially if it were Archbishop Alemany whom he charged with being biased toward the Franciscans and ignorant of the actual state of affairs in Santa Barbara.

Adding to the general charge that the Santa Barbara Franciscans made religion too easy, Bishop Amat reflected on the sad experience of the first bishop in California, Francisco García Diego y Moreno, much of whose suffering Amat

XUM

ascribed to his brother friars. Referring specifically to the Mexican, rather than Spanish, Franciscans of California, Bishop Amat said that García Diego was "in some sense martyred by them, notwithstanding that he was a member of their own Order."[10] In this erroneous generalization the bishop failed to recall that Father Narciso Durán, a member of García Diego's household in Santa Barbara, was a native of Catalonia, Spain, as Amat himself was. Ironically, perhaps to balance his portrayal, Bishop Amat referred to the good services of García Diego's faithful secretary. This secretary was, of course, José González Rubio, one of the two priests whose censure and suspension the bishop's report was attempting to uphold. In conclusion, Bishop Amat referred to the customs and practices of the Santa Barbara friars. He specifically cited their insistence on the right to beg for alms in the streets and from door to door as an occasion not only of much scandal, but also of ridicule of the Church by American Protestants in Santa Barbara.

In a second letter, directed to the officials of Propaganda Fide on April 1, 1859, Bishop Amat enlarged on his criticism of Franciscan devotional practices, pointing specifically to public processions and celebrations of the Stations of the Cross. He complained of the emotionalism and lack of decorum in such activities which caused much anti-Catholic sentiment on the part of non-Catholics.[11] Such reflections pointed to the cultural, as well as religious, evolution which occurred in Santa Barbara in the 1850's. The bishop, coming from an America caught in the tension of emerging religious pluralism, sought to transfer his experience of American Catholicism to Santa Barbara, including a sincere deference to Protestant opinion when it was consistent with the teachings of the Church. In 1844, anti-Catholic feelings in Philadelphia led to three days of rioting and armed conflict in which Catholic churches and educational institutions were vandalized and destroyed.

XUM

At the end of the 1840's, when Bishop Amat was rector of St. Charles Seminary, the American Catholic Church was trying to adjust to the American environment and to prevent such outbreaks of persecution in the future. The bishop's attitudes in Santa Barbara were quite consistent in light of his residence in Philadelphia during the aftermath of the religious violence of the 1840's and his attendance at the First Plenary Council of Baltimore which stressed national uniformity in American Catholicism.[12] On the other hand, it was also consistent for Hispanic Catholics and clergy to continue practicing their faith as they had traditionally learned it, doubtless at times even in conscious cultural resistance to their political annexation by the United States.[13]

In June of 1859, Father Cajetan Sorrentini testified to confirm Bishop Amat's position, refuting the countercharges of Francisco Caro and insisting that the friars were to be held directly responsible for enkindling the "flames of discord" against the bishop in Santa Barbara. Sorrentini made no mention of the specific allegations of his own dubious behavior which had found their way to Rome.[14] In this manner the bishop's case rested in 1859. The verdict which he sought was the expulsion of the Franciscans from his diocese, or at least their transfer from Santa Barbara to San Luis Rey.

In March of 1859, Father González Rubio was apprised of the events in Rome by Archbishop Alemany who opined that the officials of Propaganda Fide and the Franciscan Minister General remained convinced that neither he nor Father Sánchez were "bad religious nor preachers and upholders of evil doctrine."[15] The archbishop also informed him of Amat's continued insistence that the friars be moved to San Luis Rey and of his offer to contribute land and livestock for the friars' support. González Rubio's reaction to this information was more emotional than his

XUM

previously calm replies, perhaps as a result of the recent loss of Father Antonio Jimeno to the college. He wrote Francisco Caro, on March 21, 1859, that the suspension of faculties was clearly canonically illegal for lack of adequate warning and ennumeration of causes and asked the priest to press not only for a reversal of the revocation, but to seek "reparation for the grievous deed done to this community, with scandal and prejudice to the local population."[16] Furthermore, the friar flatly refused to transfer the college to San Luis Rey, stating it would essentially mean the demise of the institution since the isolated location and poverty of the area would make it impossible for the friars to survive on the alms of the faithful as their Franciscan vows necessitated. His solution was that the friars be given charge of the entire parish of Santa Barbara with the proper dispensations so they would be able to handle money, take regular collections during Mass, and collect pew rentals to support public worship. González Rubio closed by pledging obedience to any forthcoming decision in the case and asked that more priests be sent to maintain a Franciscan ministry in the diocese.[17]

In the spring of 1859, González Rubio was informed both by Father Montefranco and Archbishop Alemany that the matter was in the process of being adjudicated.[18] On May 9, 1859, Alemany reported to González Rubio that Pope Pius IX had been saddened by the friars' suspension and that matters appeared to be developing in their favor, while at the same time he urged both prudence and patience until the affair was concluded.[19] By June, González Rubio appeared a bit calmer as he wrote to the Minister General in thanksgiving for his efforts on behalf of the Santa Barbara friars. "This alone we desire," he stated, "the vindication of our good name first before God, then before our superiors, and this obtained we are satisfied."[20] By July of 1859, Father Montefranco felt that a decision was imminent, but in August,

XUM

since none had been forthcoming, he urged Cardinal Barnabò to hasten the process "since each delay could cause the death or ruination of the college."[21]

In fact, by the middle of August, 1859, the officials of Propaganda Fide had composed a detailed summary of the events and testimony on both sides of the case to aid in its adjudication.[22] But at that juncture Bishop Amat wrote to Pope Pius IX seeking to discredit the pro-Franciscan testimony because the witnesses were of dubious credibility and urging the Pontiff to wait for the arrival of authentic documentation and testimony which Father Blas Raho, the vicar general of the Diocese of Monterey, was then in the process of assembling.[23] The new testimony in favor of Amat's cause was collected in California, apparently under the direction of Father Raho, over a four-month period, commencing in mid-July and terminating in mid-October of 1859. The majority of witnesses were diocesan priests, but laymen testified as well.

On July 16, 1859, Father Doroteo Ambris, who had come to California in 1841 with Bishop García Diego as a seminarian, gave an account of the ignorance and immorality which were rampant in California in the 1840's. He testified specifically to the disobedience and stubbornness of Fathers Antonio Jimeno and José Ánzar and the scandalous behavior of Fathers José María del Real and Antonio del Real.[24] In the following month, Daniel A. Hill, along with Fathers Cypriano Rubio and Jayme Vila, testified that the dissension between the friars and the bishop was initiated by the Franciscans, especially by Antonio Jimeno who had succeeded in influencing José González Rubio.[25] On August 30, 1859, Fathers Benito Capdevilla and Francisco Mora asserted that their initial impression of the Santa Barbara Franciscans had been positive, but then they had come to realize that the religion of the town was a "religion of money."[26] And in the following month, on September 6, 1859, Ramón de la Cuesta, a layman,

XUM

issued a scathing indictment of the widespread immorality of the inhabitants of Santa Barbara.[27]

On September 8, 1859, Daniel Hill issued an evaluation of the controversy which was remarkable in its grasp of the cultural, religious, and economic nuances involved. After describing the degeneration of Santa Barbara society in the 1840's and early 1850's, he turned to reflect on the impact and ramifications of Bishop Amat's arrival and initial attempts at moral regeneration in these words:

> The laity, unaccustomed to censure or disapproval, assumed a menacing attitude and here their tongues were heard to proclaim the Bishop is heretical, and preaching doctrine different from that which they had been taught by the Franciscan friars. Of course the men were encouraged by influential parties and the mission where two or three remaining friars had established a nominal college was fixed upon as being the true and unerring Church. In fact the Bishop was too American in his principles of decorum and too much opposed to the promulgation of reverence for bogus saints and Mexican innovations![28]

Hill went on to say that the town of Santa Barbara was simply economically incapable of supporting both the secular clergy and the Franciscans and concluded by stating that the inhabitants of Santa Barbara "prefer the Fathers [i.e. the Franciscans] for the reason that they are more indulgent and better accustomed to their mode of life and I see no remedy for the evil as long as the Fathers are here."[29]

The testimony of José de Arnaz, another layman, given on the following day, was also sensitive and discerning. After lamenting the immorality of the late Mexican and early American periods, both among the clergy and the laity, and Amat's attempts at reform, he speculated that the dissension arose out of a difference of customs and the suppression of certain ceremonies which were very important to the uneducated class of people, who therefore staunchly remained loyal to the Franciscans who upheld the old customs. But Arnaz, in a postscript, added a significant qualification.

XUM

"In referring to the preference which some people have for the religious who now reside in Santa Barbara it is not my intention to confuse them with the priests I mentioned above who gave so much scandal since these have departed to Mexico."[30] Three days later, on September 12, 1859, Judge Francis J. Maguire, after issuing a general condemnation of the moral climate of Santa Barbara, exercised similar discriminating judgment by concluding: "I allude to the natives in general, not to all, for some exceptions can be found of course, who are honorable, virtuous, and worthy of respect and imitation by their countrymen!"[31]

On September 16, 1859, the diocesan priests Vicente Llover and Dominic Serrano testified that tensions began to develope after the apostolic college was moved from its downtown location back to the mission. They went on to assert that the friars' sole aim had been to drive the bishop and his clergy from Santa Barbara, for which purpose they had formed an alliance with the most prominent and most immoral citizens whose influence allowed the Franciscans to control public opinion.[32] Father Blas Raho, after concurring with this judgment, went on to indict the Mexican Franciscans as a group, and Antonio Jimeno specifically, for abandoning their ministry to the Indians, whose love for the Spanish Franciscan pioneers was matched by their hatred of the Mexican friars. He concluded by stating that the Santa Barbara friars had no respect for episcopal authority and retained the loyalty of the ignorant populace by maintaining the ceremonies, cults, and devotions of corrupt Catholicism.[33]

Father Jayme Vila, the pastor of the Santa Barbara parish, gave testimony aimed at attacking the credibility of pro-Franciscan witnesses by citing their public immorality. He referred specifically to Pablo, Antonio María, Francisco, and Joaquín de la Guerra, Luis and Antonio Arellanes, Joaquín Carrillo, and Antonio de la Palma y Mesa.[34] Writing from Santa Inés on October 11, 1859, Ulpiano Indart, a layman,

XUM

witnessed to the immorality and scandal caused in previous years by the Mexican friars Blas Ordaz and José María del Real.[35] The final recorded testimony came from Father Cypriano Rubio, also at Santa Inés, who issued a combined condemnation of past misconduct by Mexican friars and present immorality among the leading citizens of Santa Barbara whose loyalty lay with the Franciscans.[36]

Bishop Amat was absent from Rome in late 1859 and early 1860, traveling to Paris and Barcelona while he waited for the supportive documentation to arrive. On December 20, 1859, he wrote Cardinal Barnabò from Paris asking him to be patient since the needed testimony, which was indispensable to prove the truth of his accusations, might take as long as six months to arrive.[37] But, on January 10, 1860, Bishop Amat again wrote the Cardinal, this time from Barcelona, stating that he was sending all the documents he had received by way of Father Cajetan Sorrentini. He concluded: "I hope Your Eminence will be satisfied with the justice of my cause."[38] The documents which Amat sent to Propaganda Fide contained all the testimony reviewed above.[39] On February 4, 1860, Father Sorrentini gave testimony to the officials of Propaganda Fide charging Father Francisco Sánchez with erroneous and imprudent preaching regarding the doctrine of hell and the need to give alms, as well as laxity in the confessional. He stated further that Father González Rubio, having been uninvolved in the internal affairs of the Santa Barbara friars for many years, had no knowledge of, nor power to ameliorate, the "torrent of iniquity" there.[40]

During the late summer and fall of 1859, as the pro-Amat testimony was being assembled and sent to Europe, José González Rubio and Francisco Sánchez had no option but to wait patiently while their fate was being decided. Father Montefranco sent encouraging words from Rome on August 20, 1859, by reiterating his belief in the friars' innocence and his compassion for their sufferings.[41] González Rubio,

XUM

on October 24, 1859, answered Montefranco "saying that although the sufferings the friars underwent were great they were nothing compared with the joy of a clear conscience, and the clear, explicit and favorable testimony given by the Minister General."[42] In November, Archbishop Alemany expressed anxiety over the lack of a decision in Rome, but in early December he wrote González Rubio stating that "he had indirect but authentic information that the whole affair was decided favorably for the friars in Rome, but that probably Amat would ask for another investigation and verdict."[43]

Archbishop Alemany's information regarding the imminence of a decision in the case proved correct. On February 13, 1860, the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide convened to discuss all the assembled evidence and succeeded in issuing a verdict.[44] On March 7, 1860, Cardinal Barnabò informed Bishop Amat of the specific stipulations of the decision in these words:

> "In the General Congregation of last February 13, the case between you, Esteemed Sir, and the Franciscan Fathers of Santa Barbara was submitted to the Very Eminent Fathers. The resolution taken by the Sacred Congregation, which was approved later with small changes by His Holiness, is the following:
>
> "That the above-mentioned Fathers must humbly ask for their much desired rehabilitation and that you, following the advice of the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda Fide, ask the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor for four or six good esteemed religious to be sent to Santa Barbara; these religious must not be Mexicans, they must be under the direction of a qualified superior who supervises the discipline, and that after some months he give the obedience to the two Fathers, that is, Father González and Father Sánchez, for other convents outside of the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles, and that you, Esteemed Sir, at the same time, return the parish of Santa Barbara to the Franciscan Fathers."[45]

Barnabò closed the letter with a request that Amat would "simply conform to the resolution" without further delay.

XUM

On March 20, 1860, after depositing a summary of the verdict in the Franciscan Curial Archives, Minister General Montefranco apprised González Rubio concerning the specifics of the decision, stating that if Bishop Amat continued to be reluctant regarding the return of their faculties the friars were to have recourse to Rome for further directives and also informing him that Propaganda Fide would bear the expense of transporting the new Franciscans to Santa Barbara. Then the Minister General adverted to the ordination of the three clerics, Francisco Codina, José Godayol, and José Alcina, of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, which had been delayed due to the controversy.

> Meanwhile Your Paternity will see to it that those our clerics shall be promoted to sacred orders if they are of age and have the necessary qualifications. If the bishop is absent or if he is not holding ordinations, our students, according to the privileges granted to our Order, may be presented to any bishop holding ordinations, particularly to the nearest bishop. However for this there is required the attestation that the bishop of the diocese is not holding ordinations at the stated time and this attestation must be signed by the bishop himself or by his vicar general.[46]

On the same day, March 20, 1860, Montefranco told Cardinal Barnabò that he was very happy with the verdict which allowed the friars to keep their integrity and that he had informed them of their obligation to petition Bishop Amat for the return of their faculties.[47]

In June of 1860, González Rubio expressed the overwhelming joy which the decision had brought in a letter to Father Montefranco. He agreed to "most humbly" ask Bishop Amat for the restoration of faculties for hearing confession and preaching, promising to notify Rome if the bishop proved reluctant. The friar continued that, according to the directive received, he was petitioning Archbishop Alemany to ordain the three clerics, but he would wait for Bishop Amat's

return should the archbishop refuse. Finally, he petitioned that one of the new Franciscans who was to be assigned to the college be appointed as its president stating that "in order to make it grow and prosper both in a material and a formal sense, there is need of a man endowed with great gifts and virtues" so that he himself who was "weak and useless" could be relieved of the burden which was beyond his strength.[48]

Archbishop Alemany received news from González Rubio concerning the resolution of the controversy and the friars' request that he ordain the Franciscan clerics in June of 1860.[49] On June 16, he sent his enthusiastic congratulations to González Rubio and agreed to ordain the clerics provided Father Blas Raho, Bishop Amat's vicar-general, would certify in writing that the bishop was absent and no ordinations were being held in the diocese.[50] On July 11, 1860, Father Raho provided the necessary certification and, on August 6, 1860, González Rubio, acting in his capacity as president of the apostolic college, issued the dimissorial letters attesting his official approval for the clerics to be ordained.[51] Accordingly, on August 15, 1860, Archbishop Alemany ordained Francisco Codina, José Godayol, and José Alcina to the priesthood. These ordinations had been delayed four years by the intervening controversy. On the same day, Brother Bernardine Sheehan, who had been received as a Franciscan novice at the apostolic college on March 5, 1856, was ordained to the diaconate. These four young Franciscans have been referred to as "the first fruits of the struggling apostolic college."[52]

But in Rome the decision of Propaganda Fide had failed to convince Bishop Amat that his cause was lost. On June 30, 1860, the prelate directed two letters to the officials of Propaganda Fide stating his continuing doubts about the verdict. He protested that it would violate his conscience to allow Fathers Sánchez and González Rubio to hear confessions and attempted to overturn the decision to ultimately restore the Santa Barbara parish to the friars.[53]

In addition, the bishop submitted eleven questions concerning the future relationship between his diocese and the Franciscans, attempting to delineate their exact obligations and privileges, and intimating that they would have to be restrained from soliciting the loyalty and financial support of the faithful outside the boundaries of their own parish.[54] In July, 1860, the Roman officials took note of Amat's new objections and affirmed their belief that the original verdict would be upheld, stating that it was the wish of Pope Pius IX that Amat simply obey the decision.[55]

Sometime in late July or early August of 1860 Bishop Amat received information in a letter from Father Cypriano Rubio, dated June 9, 1860, which he sought to use to strengthen his appeal of the Roman decision. Rubio reported to Amat a rumor he had heard in San Luis Obispo to the effect that the Santa Barbara friars had a celebration or celebrations, including a Mass, to "give thanks to the Almighty for the triumph they had obtained in Rome over the bishop," and that the people of Santa Barbara were clamoring for the parish to be returned to the friars.[56] On June 21, 1860, Father Rubio sent Bishop Amat more information concerning the friars' alleged victory celebration and Amat communicated it to Cardinal Barnabò on August 14, 1860, stating that such behavior indicated the "bad faith and evil intentions" of the Santa Barbara friars. The prelate insisted that he must condemn such conduct because "the honor and dignity of the Episcopate" demanded it.[57] In the same month, on August 18, 1860, Father Montefranco, unaware of these added protestations of Bishop Amat, urged Barnabò to hasten the rehabilitation of the friars.[58]

Cardinal Barnabò wrote Bishop Amat on September 21, 1860, expressing his dismay at the prelate's further attempts to press his case. Referring to the response of Pope Pius IX to the matter, Barnabò clarified the situation for the bishop in these words:

> Now I tell you that His Holiness wishes that you, purely and simply, carry out the relative decree of the Congregation concerning the rehabilitation of the above-mentioned Fathers. Can you, Esteemed Sir, reasonably raise the question of conscience? No, because when a superior authority cognita causa commands what has to be done, the conscience of the inferior must feel the duty of obedience and must conform to the superior authority and cannot at all make a judgment of his own.[59]

But, in October, Amat persisted in writing to Roman officials to muster support for his position, stating that he had considered the case closed until he received news of the Franciscan affront to his dignity and that his conscience would not allow him to cancel the suspension of faculties. He argued that this option was open to him since Cardinal Barnabò had informed him that the verdict in the case was merely a suggestion and not a command.[60]

On the same day, October 6, 1860, Bishop Amat wrote to Barnabò answering the request for obedience which the Cardinal had sent him in September. The bishop insisted that he was not disobeying the Congregation's decree but merely asking that his doubts be resolved since the rehabilitation of the friars' faculties went against his conscience. Amat went on to remind Barnabò that the Cardinal himself had told him, on July 5, 1860, that the Pope's decision was an admonition, not a command, which was to be acted upon according to the bishop's own evaluation of the friars' worthiness.[61] But Cardinal Barnabò could not be persuaded by the bishop's arguments. On November 9, 1860, he wrote Amat reviewing his previous attempts at securing the bishop's co-operation and concluded with a pointed request for the prelate's immediate compliance in the following manner:

> However when we knew that you did not intend to follow directions and that you were still raising new doubts which were leaving the Franciscans still suspended, the Holy Father

> ordered that you had simply to execute the desire of the Sacred Congregation of February 13, which execution is really what I communicated to you with my letter of the 21st of September.[62]

The clarity and finality of Barnabò's letter seemed to satisfy Bishop Amat. In any event, the bishop prepared to depart from Europe to return to California and there is no record of further protests on his part before he commenced his voyage.

NOTES

CHAPTER VIII

[1]Amat to Barnabò, Rome, January 5, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 166-167.

[2]Montefranco to Bedini, Rome, Janaury 15, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[3]Amat to Barnabò, Rome, January 29, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. Amat to Propaganda Fide, Rome, February 1, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[4]Geiger, op. cit., p. 166. cf. González Rubio to Caro, Santa Barbara, February 22, 1959, FCR.

[5]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, February 1, 1859, SBMA. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, March 2, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 167.

[6]Weber, California's Reluctant Prelate, p. 61.

[7]Amat to Pius IX, Rome, March 3, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[8]This summary is found in Weber, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

[9]Such warnings may have been given personally, rather than in writing, since no correspondence concerning them was discovered by the present writer in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives.

[10]Regarding this accusation, Weber states that it "is certainly not true." Weber, op. cit., p. 62.

[11]Amat to Propaganda Fide, Rome, April 1, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[12]For a study of Protestant-Catholic tensions and resultant violence in Philadelphia in the 1840's cf. Ray Allen Billington, The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), p. 220-237. The First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852), which Amat attended, sought to regularize American Catholic practices to make them more relevant to the Church's experience in the United States. While Propaganda Fide publicly approved the decrees of this council, it privately warned the American Church "regarding the growth of exceptions as well as the dangers that lay in

a too rigid national uniformity. Everything that tended by an accumulation of exceptions to give the American Church the semblance of a national Church was to be avoided." Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore, p. 181.

[13]The Protestant presence in Santa Barbara in the 1850's consisted of a small number of individuals, and not any organized Protestant churches. Adam Bland attempted to start a Methodist Church in Santa Barbara with six members in 1854, but the enterprise collapsed after a year due to lack of membership. In October of 1855, the Right Reverend William I. Kip, first bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in California, visited Santa Barbara, but the absence of any substantial Protestant constituency dissuaded him from holding a worship service during his stay. The present writer has been unable to uncover any documentation concerning any meeting between these Protestant clergymen and the Santa Barbara Franciscans. It was not until 1867 that a Protestant Church took root in Santa Barbara. On September 6 of that year the Ecclesiastical Society of the Congregational Faith and Order was officially founded there. Considering the total absence of Protestant institutions in Santa Barbara during the years of the Amat-Franciscan controversies, Bishop Amat's worries about scandal seem directed as much to American cultural standards as to Protestant theological criteria. cf. Hogue, "A History of Religion," pp. 138, 221-222,

[14]Sorrentini to Propaganda Fide, Rome, June 13, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. cf. ch. 7, note 82.

[15]Alemany to Gonzalez Rubio, San Francisco, March 17, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 168.

[16]González Rubio to Caro, Santa Barbara, March 21, 1859, FCR.

[17]In April, 1859, Archbishop Alemany also urged that the friars not be sent to San Luis Rey, pointing to its geographical isolation and poverty. cf. Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, April 4, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[18]Montefranco to González Rubio, Rome, April 26, 1859, SBMA. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, May 2, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 168-170.

[19]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, May 9, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 169. cf. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, June 18, 1859, SBMA. Alemany to González Rubio, San José, June 28, 1859, SBMA.

[20]González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, June 22, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 170.

[21]Montefranco to Barnabò, Rome, August 13, 1859, PAR, vol. 18. cf. Montefranco to Caro, Rome, July 21, 1859, FCR.

[22]Sommario, Rome, August 17, 1859, PAR, vol. 224.

[23]Amat to Pius IX, Paris, August 17, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[24]Ambris, San Antonio, July 16, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[25]Hill, Rubio, Vila, Santa Barbara, August 22, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. It will be recalled that Father Antonio Jimeno had departed for Mexico at the end of January, 1859, about six months before these accusations surfaced.

[26]Capdevilla, Mora, San Juan Bautista and Santa Cruz, August 30, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[27]De la Cuesta, Rancho de la Espada, September 6, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[28]Hill, Santa Barbara, September 8, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. For more on the cultural tension between Mexican and American Catholicism in early American California cf. Pitt, The Decline of the Californios, pp. 214-228.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Arnaz, San Buenaventura, September 9, 1859, AALA. In this postscript, Arnaz exhonerated Fathers Sánchez and González Rubio from the general condemnation of Mexican Franciscans in California which filled the pro-Amat testimony.

[31]Maguire, San Francisco, September 12, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[32]Llover, Serrano, San Diego and San Gabriel, September 16, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[33]Raho, Los Angeles, September 30, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[34]Vila, Santa Barbara, September 21, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[35]Indart, Santa Inés, October 11, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[36]Rubio, Santa Inés, October 20, 1859, PAR, vol. 985. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 176. There is considerable evidence to substantiate these allegations of irregular conduct on the part of certain Mexican Franciscans in California. Father José Antonio Anzar was reputated to have taken time from his priestly duties at Mission San Juan Bautista to engage in ranching and commercial activities. Various reports may be found testifying to the incontinence and resultant scandal in the behavior of Fathers Blas Ordaz, José José María del Real, and Jesús Vásquez del Mercado. Father Antonio del Real was credited with a penchant for gambling and excessive drinking. The latter vice was also attributed to Father José Lorenzo Quijas. Guilt by association, however, was not enough to impugn the characters of Fathers Sánchez and González Rubio, both of whom had excellent reputations for the duration of their careers in California. cf. Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, pp. 17-18, 172-174, 202-203, 248-251, 262.

[37]Amat to Barnabò, Paris, December 20, 1859, PAR, vol. 985.

[38]Amat to Barnabò, Barcelona, January 10, 1860, PAR, vol. 985.

[39]Amat to Propaganda Fide, Barcelona, January 10, 1860, AALA. cf. Expediente, Barcelona and Rome, January 10, 1860, PAR, vol. 224.

[40]Sorrentini to Propaganda Fide, Rome, February 4, 1860, PAR, vol. 985.

[41]Montefranco to González Rubio, Rome, August 20, 1859, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XII:4 (April, 1950), 170.

[42]Geiger, loc. cit. cf. González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, October 24, 1859, FCR.

[43]Geiger, loc. cit., cf. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, November 18, 1859, SBMA. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, December 2, 1859, SBMA.

[44]Ristretto con sommario sopra una vertenza insorta fra il vescovo di Monterey in California e i P.P. Francescani residenti in quella Diocesi, Rome, February 13, 1860, PAR, vol. 224. Weber, op. cit., p. 63.

[45]Barnabò to Amat, Rome, March 7, 1860, AALA.

XUM

[46]Montefranco to González Rubio, Rome, March 20, 1860, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:1 (July, 1950), 2. cf. Franciscan Curia, Rome, March 20, 1860, FCR.

[47]Montefranco to Barnabò, Rome, March 20, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[48]González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, June 18, 1860, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

[49]González Rubio to Alemany, Santa Barbara, n.d., AALA.

[50]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, June 16, 1860, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 4.

[51]Raho, Santa Barbara, July 11, 1860, SBMA. González Rubio, dimissorial letter, Santa Barbara, August 6, 1860, SBMA. Geiger, loc. cit.

[52]Geiger, loc. cit. For information regarding Sheehan's arrival at the apostolic college cf. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 340.

[53]Amat to Propaganda Fide, Rome, June 30, 1860, PAR, vol. 987. Proganda Fide, Rome, April 22, 1861, PAR, vol. 987.

[54]Amat to Propaganda Fide, Rome June 30, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[55]Caterini, notes, Rome, July 16, 1860, PAR, vol. 985. Rinaldini to Caterini, Rome, July 17, 1860, PAR, vol. 18.

[56]Amat to Barnabò, Barcelona, August 5, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[57]Amat to Barnabò, Barcelona, August 14, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[58]Montefranco to Barnabò, Rome, August 18, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[59]Barnabò to Amat, Rome, September 21, 1860, AALA.

[60]Amat to Cardinal Vicar, Paris, October 6, 1860, PAR, vol. 18. Amat to Cardinal Vicar, Paris, October 6, 1860, PAR, vol. 18.

[61]Amat to Barnabò, Paris, October 6, 1860, PAR, vol. 987.

[62]Barnabò to Amat, Rome, November 9, 1860, AALA.

CHAPTER IX

THE APOSTOLIC COLLEGE (1861-1873)

At the beginning of April, 1861, Bishop Amat arrived back in the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles. José González Rubio sent him a warm letter of welcome on April 5, 1861.[1] Three days later, on April 8, the friar sent a lengthy letter to the bishop which contained two petitions.[2] The first asked that Amat grant diocesan faculties to the three young Franciscans whom Alemany had ordained to the priesthood in the bishop's absence. The second requested that Bishop Amat restore diocesan faculties to Father Francisco Sánchez and to González Rubio himself.[3] On April 18, 1861, Bishop Amat responded that he wished to investigate the ordination of the young priests before granting faculties to them. He then confronted González Rubio with the friars' alleged victory celebration and the concomitant rumor that their faculties had already been restored by Roman decree, telling González Rubio that he could not restore their faculties until such information was clarified.[4]

In a letter dated April 22, 1861, González Rubio informed Bishop Amat that he would gladly allow him to examine the newly-ordained priests in the hope that their faculties could then be granted.[5] But he devoted the bulk of the letter to explaining the circumstances of the friars' alleged indiscretion, stating that the day after word of the verdict arrived the friars celebrated a Mass of thanksgiving, without pomp or puerile manifestations of pride and motivated only by "pious sentiments of gratitude to God," with no lay people in attendance. But after many days of keeping the news to themselves, González Rubio continued,

they felt it would be permissible to share it with Pablo de la Guerra, their apostolic syndic, and a few days later they also told one of De la Guerra's brothers who stopped by for a casual visit. González Rubio insisted that in none of this did the friars assume a frivolous attitude or an air of triumphalism, nor did they themselves imagine or communicate to anyone that their faculties had been restored by Church authorities in Rome, adding that if this were the case, he would not have petitioned Amat himself for their rehabilitation. The friar concluded by once again asking the bishop to effect the restoration of their faculties.

On May 4, 1861, Bishop Amat officially restored González Rubio's faculties.[6] At the same time the bishop delayed in restoring the faculties of Francisco Sánchez. González Rubio personally pleaded for Sánchez's rehabilitation "amid tears" and it was effected on May 9, 1861.[7] Along with his initial refusal to rehabilitate Sánchez, on May 4, 1861, Bishop Amat questioned the validity of the dimissorial letters issued by González Rubio for the ordination of Alcina, Godayol, and Codina, stating that the friars had no such authority since "every community of regulars [i.e. order priests] which consists of less than twelve religious is subject entirely to the jurisdiction of the bishop."[8] With this statement a new stage in the controversies between Bishop Amat and the Santa Barbara Franciscans commenced because, in essence, the bishop was challenging the very canonical legality and concomitant rights of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows.

That González Rubio was immediately aware of the deepest implications of Bishop Amat's allegation was witnessed by the response he sent to the bishop on the following day, May 5, 1861.[9] After explaining the steps he had taken to insure the legality of the ordinations, such as obtaining Father Raho's attestation as vicar general that the bishop was absent from the diocese, González Rubio squarely dealt

with the issue of the nature and legal status of the Santa Barbara college in this manner:

> This poor house, Your Excellency, is not a convent simpliciter, i.e. a house subject to another higher religious house, but an apostolic seminary which is dependent solely on the superior general of our Order and the Roman Pontiff according to that which was ordained by our Holy Father, Pope Innocent XI, who elevated our colleges to the category of provinces and so the College of Our Lady of Sorrows is not included in the decree which Your Excellency cites.[10] However even if this were not so, the said decree speaks of those convents which are not self-sustaining through rents and alms, and which de facto do not have twelve friars. But this convent of Santa Barbara, although today it does not have that number, will soon have them and be able to maintain them. Up to now it has never been demonstrated nor has the doubt ever arisen (owing to our economical way of living and our poor mode of life) as to whether it is capable of sustaining twelve friars. Much less has the competent authority declared it beyond the privilege or exemption or placed us as subject to the ordinary.[11]

After this argumentation designed to convince the bishop that the College of Our Lady of Sorrows was a legally constituted apostolic seminary which enjoyed the appropriate privileges and exemption from the direct control of the local bishop, whether it had more than twelve friars or not, González Rubio turned to the question of his own power to issue dimissorial letters for the ordination of Franciscan clerics.[12] The friar began by admitting that the guardian of a simple convent could not issue such dimissorial letters; but he continued that since the college at Santa Barbara was in fact an apostolic seminary he, as president, was granted the power to issue such dimissorials by a decree of Pope Pius VI, Decet Romanum Pontificem, issued on December 12, 1797.[13] González Rubio continued that he had this power even though he had the title of president rather than guardian and was appointed rather than elected,

since these stipulations had been included in the original constitutions of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows with Roman approval, and that it was clearly stated in these constitutions that the president exercised the same authority as a guardian, including the right to propose clerics for ordination in dimissorial letters. In light of all this, González Rubio concluded that the three Franciscans had been legally ordained and once again asked the bishop to award them diocesan faculties.

But the bishop remained unconvinced. He replied to González Rubio's arguments two days later, on May 7, 1861, saying that none of the decrees which the friar had cited were relevant to the institution at Santa Barbara since it was not then, nor had it ever been, an apostolic college in the legal sense. Amat contended that the original permission to found the institution stipulated a convent or college, the latter word "college" being used in an appositive, expletive, and generic sense as referring to the convent which, therefore, was the only institution petitioned and approved.[14] Therefore, Amat contended, the three Franciscans had been ordained illegally since González Rubio did not have the power of the president of an apostolic college to issue dimissorial letters.

Three days later, on May 10, 1861, González Rubio attempted to refute this latest argument of the bishop by stating that it had been patent to all the parties involved in the foundation of the Santa Barbara institution, including the Roman officials, Archbishop Alemany, and the friars themselves, that the permission given referred both to the convent or friary and to the subsequently founded apostolic college.[15] He pointedly asked the bishop: "On what ground do you stand, Your Excellency? On the mere statement that it is not evident to you although we have the pontifical faculty authorizing us to found a convent or college."[16]

XUM

The friar argued that the word "or" (seu in Latin) was used as a disjunctive, meaning that the convent and college did not refer to the same entity and that it was so understood by all the founders of the institution who de facto had legally established an apostolic college.[17] He concluded by telling Bishop Amat that if such explanations still failed to convince him it would be advisable to appeal the matter to Rome and to abide by the official decision.

On May 17, 1861, González Rubio apprised Father Montefranco, the Franciscan Minister General, of the friars' latest point of disagreement with the bishop.[18] After narrating his attempts at convincing the bishop of the friars' position, he said that he had failed since he was contending "with a bishop endowed with a vivid imagination, resourceful cleverness and an exaggerated notion of episcopal dignity," and one who was "greatly displeased to hear opinions contrary to his own" and consistently thought "that his opinions should prevail." González Rubio concluded by asking the Minister General for specific instructions regarding the new dispute and urged him to send the promised new Franciscans as soon as possible, including a new appointee to the presidency of the apostolic college who could "defend it with dignity against the systematic oppression" with which Bishop Amat persisted in attacking it. On May 21, 1861, Bishop Amat informed González Rubio that he would not accept the status or exemption of the college from his jurisdiction until its prior foundation as an apostolic seminary was documented or new privileges and exemptions were granted by the Pope.[19]

During the summer of 1861, Father Montefranco worked steadily in Rome on two projects in response to González Rubio's narration of the latest occurrences in Santa Barbara. He recruited and examined possible Franciscan candidates for assignment to the Apostolic College

of Our Lady of Sorrows, issuing numerous reports on his progress, complaining about the inability of the Order to provide transportation money when the group was formed, and seeking advice and counsel in his personal decisions from Monsignor Annabile Capalti, Secretary of Propaganda Fide.[20] At the same time, on July 19, 1861, Montefranco reviewed the new tensions in California for Cardinal Alessandro Barnabò, stating that beneath all the details was Bishop Amat's self-image as a modern reformer of the Church and that such reformers had no use for religious orders. He asked the Cardinal to aid in the resolution of this new stage of the dispute between the bishop and the friars.[21]

The officials of Propaganda Fide, however, had already decided to take action to deal with the new dispute and, on June 14, 1861, Archbishop Alemany was appointed as the new apostolic visitor to investigate and adjudicate the situation.[22] On August 27, 1861, Alemany advised both González Rubio and Bishop Amat of his appointment, informing the latter that the "diocese would soon have this wound healed up quietly, yet justly, without giving to anybody, Catholic or Protestant, the unnecessary occasion of remark."[23] Bishop Amat railed at the appointment of Alemany whom he considered blatantly pro-Franciscan in a letter to Cardinal Barnabò dated September 2, 1861.[24] But, on the following day, the prelate wrote to Alemany assuring him of his total co-operation and promising to send all the relevant documents for the archbishop's evaluation.[25]

José González Rubio wrote to Archbishop Alemany on September 4, 1861, saying that he himself was willing to leave the diocese if this were "necessary for the peace and tranquility of Bishop Amat."[26] At the same time he lamented the sufferings of his confreres, especially the three young Franciscan priests whom Amat would allow to say Mass only in private. Regarding the new dispute, González Rubio affirmed that a lasting solution depended "not on the

clinching of arguments, nor on the concrete expression of judicial formulas, nor on the ingenious handling of investigations, but solely on that victorious grace which animates the human heart."[27] On the same day, September 4, 1861, Archbishop Alemany informed Barnabò that he was ready to commence his investigation and that he was enlisting the aid of two canon lawyers to help in arriving at a just verdict.[28]

In September of 1861, Archbishop Alemany commenced his task as apostolic visitor by attempting to convince Bishop Amat that, from the very inception of the movement to found a Franciscan institution in Santa Barbara in order to perpetuate the Order's ministry in California, it had been his intention to establish exactly what the friars wanted. And what they most certainly wanted was an apostolic college.[29] In addition, Alemany denied Amat's contention that a bishop has direct jurisdiction over a community of religious if they number less than twelve, emphasizing that such an arrangement existed nowhere in the Church, neither in the United States nor in Europe. The archbishop concluded by counseling Amat to "make a mighty, big, good, holy, heroic act of mortification about this business" and follow the road of peace and arbitration.[30] On October 26, 1861, Amat responded sharply to the archbishop's advice in these words:

> ...and I sincerely thank you for the good advices and your good intentions: but allow me to say that there is no question of performing acts of mortification, of which I was already tired before the question was brought to Rome: the Religious have always claimed something more than that; they claim "rights," and right and justice is what I reclaim too, in order to have unalterable and everlasting peace in my diocese.[31]

During January of 1862, Alemany traveled to Santa Barbara to get another personal view of the situation. In the following month he wrote Bishop Amat that his opinion

XUM

of the friars there as well as their sincere regard for the bishop had been confirmed once again during his January visit.[32] On the same day, February 18, 1862, Alemany urged Amat to concede faculties to the three young Franciscan priests.[33] On the following day, Alemany informed Cardinal Barnabo that he had decided, as apostolic visitor, that Bishop Amat should give faculties to the three priests since the bishop's refusal was predicated on the dubious argument that the president of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Father González Rubio, did not possess the proper authority to issue dimissorial letters. The archbishop believed that Amat's reluctance really stemmed from his reaction to the alleged triumphalism of the friars in regard to their own rehabilitation, which allegation Alemany flatly rejected. He concluded the letter with a statement of his own evaluation of the friars' conduct in the entire affair.

> But I became even more convinced that the Fathers, instead of speaking against the bishop have, to the contrary, contributed much to pacifying the people when they speak against the bishop, and that all this would have amounted to nothing if someone had not preoccupied the mind of Bishop Amat, who always seems to be good and loving in providing for the spiritual good of his flock.[34]

In the winter of 1862, Bishop Amat informed González Rubio that he agreed to examine the three Franciscan priests to further clarify his decision regarding their faculties. But, at the same time, he told Archbishop Alemany that this did not mean that he had changed his position, for he still believed that González Rubio had no power to recommend clerics for ordination in dimissorial letters.[35] On April 10, 1862, Alemany once again informed Amat that his opinion was erroneous since all the persons involved in the foundation of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows, including the archbishop himself, had positively intended

it to be a duly authorized apostolic seminary.[36] To this Bishop Amat unexpectedly responded that, at last, the matter had been clarified for him and he lamented that he had not been given such information two years earlier![37] The bishop stated that his confusion had arisen from the legal circumstances of the transfer of the college back to the mission in 1856. Then he concluded with the surprising charge that the Santa Barbara friars had conspired to found their institution independently of the Franciscan Minister General in Rome who was never advised of the matter by the friars until Amat himself went to Rome.[38]

After this response of Bishop Amat there was a noticeable decrease in the correspondence regarding the status of the apostolic college and the concrete resolution of the dispute in regard to the actual granting of faculties to the three Franciscan priests by the bishop. This may be ascribed, in part, to the advent of both natural and political upheavals in Santa Barbara and all of Southern California which absorbed the attention of the concerned parties and their lay constituencies.

The agrarian economy of Southern California was based primarily on cattle raising and was the mainstay of Spanish-speaking political and economic power. This economy had begun to suffer a noticeable decline as early as 1861 when Pedro C. Carrillo of Santa Barbara wrote that cattle could be bought at rock bottom prices and real estate was worth practically nothing.[39] The situation grew worse when torrential rains pelted Southern California from November 11, 1861, to January 27, 1862, depositing an estimated fifty inches of rain in the downpour. The area in and around Santa Barbara suffered from floods and landslides as a result of the storms and a survey of damages in the town "revealed losses of $10,000 to $20,000 in drowned stock, broken fences, uprooted orchard trees and waterlogged homes."[40] The rich grazing lands which re-

sulted from the rains in the spring and summer of 1862 gave a false hope for an end to the natural disasters, for in 1863 and 1864 the torrential rains gave way to two years of unrelenting drought. It was not until 1865 that the rains returned to cause the ranges to be covered with grass once again, but by then the results were devasting. In Los Angeles County as many as three million head of cattle were lost by 1864 and, between 1862 and 1865, only 5,000 of the previous 200,000 head of cattle survived in Santa Barbara County where, in April of 1864, ranchers auctioned off 50,000 animals at the lowest prices ever, 37½ cents a head.[41] The financial blow suffered by the Spanish-speaking in these natural disasters served to effectively break their social and political power by the end of the 1860's and also inflicted economic reverses on the Catholic Church to which most of them belonged.

During the same years in which these natural upheavals plagued Southern California, the issue of the American Civil War caused political questions to come to light in Santa Barbara. There was a strong pro-Confederacy faction in Los Angeles which was said to include about one-third of the town's Spanish-speaking population.[42] In Santa Barbara, however, the Spanish-speaking community coalesced into a solid Unionist bloc. This fact was demonstrated in the judiciary election of 1863. Pablo de la Guerra, a Democrat who by 1861 had nevertheless come out in support of the Union, attempted to unseat District Judge Benjamin Hayes, a leader of the pro-Confederacy faction in Southern California.[43] The election became a three-way race when Joaquín Carrillo declared himself a Unionist candidate on the grounds that De la Guerra's Democratic affiliation rendered his Unionist sympathies suspect. The campaign was waged in the fall of 1863 and the election took place on October 23 of that year. Even though the Union League of Santa Barbara had finally backed Carrillo,

Pablo de la Guerra was victorious with the desicive margin coming from the Spanish-speaking voters of Santa Barbara.[44] There is no correspondence to indicate the political position of the Santa Barbara friars in regard to the Civil War, but it would not be unreasonable to assume that they agreed with the overwhelmingly Unionist sympathies of the Hispanic-Americans of Santa Barbara, especially since they were so closely associated with Pablo de la Guerra who continued to function as their apostolic syndic in the war years.[45]

The disagreement between Bishop Amat and the Santa Barbara Franciscans over the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows continued through these disastrous years and beyond, although it was carried on at a slower pace. By the summer of 1862, the officials of Propaganda Fide seemed convinced that Amat had indicated his total willingness to comply with Alemany's directive to give faculties to the three Franciscan priests and they informed the bishop that they were pleased with his co-operation.[46] Early in 1863, Bishop Amat awarded González Rubio many of the original faculties he had held when he was the bishop's vicar general from 1856 to 1858.[47] This would seem to indicate that the bishop had renewed confidence in González Rubio's worthiness as a priest, but two months later, on April 29, 1863, the friar wrote his Minister General that the Franciscans still suffered from Amat's antipathy and therefore they awaited an even more definitive judgment from Archbishop Alemany.[48] In response to this, Father Rafael a Ponticulo, who had replaced Montefranco as the Franciscan Minister General, assured González Rubio that Propaganda Fide had rendered a new verdict in the case. He declined to give specifics, but only said that the decision was similar to the original verdict of February 13, 1860, and urged the friars to continue in their good work at the college.[49]

During the remainder of 1863 and most of 1864, no word of such a new Roman verdict arrived in California. In September of 1864, González Rubio again pressed Archbishop Alemany to clarify the matter. On September 21, 1864, Alemany again approved González Rubio's contention that he, as president of a duly authorized apostolic college, had the authority to propose candidates for ordination in dimissorial letters. But since Amat still held the contrary opinion, the archbishop promised to send the bishop specific permission to grant the contested faculties. The archbishop gave a clear statement of his position in the following postscript:

> Although I do not consider the question decided, namely that all convents which actually do not have twelve religious are subject to the bishop, to me it seems sufficiently clear that this (my opinion) is the mind of the Supreme Pontiffs...It appears evident that you are the superior and that you do not have to be named or confirmed in office by the bishop. Consequently it is clear to me that you can and ought to issue dimissorial letters for your subjects and when you and your clerics present them, they cannot incur any penalty of the law, whether the bishop accepts them or not.[50]

Alemany's statements must have influenced Bishop Amat for in the following month, on October 12, 1864, he at last conceded faculties to the young Franciscan priests.[51] The initial request for the faculties had been made by González Rubio on April 8, 1861. Hence, the disagreement had caused a three-and-one-half year delay in the ministerial activity of the three priests. In the following year, on February 6, 1865, Bishop Amat at last decided that the Franciscans would be allowed to remain in Santa Barbara, provided they agreed to refrain from public begging for alms and to aid the bishop by preaching missions in various parts of the diocese. He urged the Franciscans to sustain themselves by selling produce from the mission gardens and vineyard and by operating a badly-needed school for boys.[52]

XUM

Such an improvement in the relationship between Bishop Amat and the Santa Barbara friars was not an indication that the bishop's mind had changed concerning his doubts about the status of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows. Three years later, in January of 1868, when two more Franciscan clerics of the college, Jeremiah Joseph O'Keefe and Pacificus Wade, were ready for ordination, Amat once again balked at González Rubio's authority to issue dimissorial letters.[53] On January 16, 1868, Archbishop Alemany wrote to both González Rubio and Amat reiterating his approval for the bishop to ordain the Franciscan clerics.[54] On February 17, 1868, Bishop Amat agreed to ordain the clerics, not because of his acceptance of González Rubio's authority, but because of Alemany's consent, "always though with the proper protest" until the Holy See gave a definitive ruling.[55] On September 19, 1868, Bishop Amat ordained O'Keefe and Wade to the priesthood in the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows in Santa Barbara.

The doubts of Bishop Amat regarding the status of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows were never settled during the presidency of José González Rubio which was terminated on May 3, 1872, with the appointment of Father José María Romo as his successor.[56] During 1873, Romo, Amat, and the Franciscan Minister General in Rome continued to engage in correspondence designed to effect an agreement on the issue.[57] In fact, the controversy ended in a stalemate with Bishop Amat insisting that Rome had never given a sufficient verdict and that Alemany's authority as apostolic visitor had long since expired.[58] In this way, the controversy which had occasioned so much frustration for José González Rubio and the Santa Barbara friars, and for Bishop Amat as well, slowly ground to a halt.

The final phase of the controversies between Amat and the Franciscans must be seen in the context of the difficult transition which the Diocese of Monterey and Los

Angeles had to undergo from being a Spanish-speaking missionary church to being an integral part of the Catholic Church in the United States. In addition to the change in the structure of Catholic authority in these years, there was a simultaneous change in the political and social composition of the inhabitants of Southern California due primarily to the influx of Anglo-American immigrants after the Civil War. By 1872, Southern California had evolved from a Mexican cattle frontier to a part of the American commonwealth.[59] It is in light of these contextual factors that the anxiety of Bishop Amat over the foundation of proper diocesan authority in Southern California, as manifested in his reluctance to admit the legal status of the apostolic college and the authority of González Rubio, must be understood. But the grounds for the bishop's position were certainly tenuous, based as they were on unproven rumors of Franciscan disrespect for his authority. Especially in regard to González Rubio, such a charge seems dubious considering the friar's previous concern to respect the episcopal authority of Francisco García Diego, his service as the first bishop's secretary, his tenure as governor of the mitre which entailed being a bishop in everything but name, and his distinguished service as vicar general for both Alemany and Amat. Such a record does not indicate a man who lacked either understanding or respect for the office and dignity of the bishop.

In addition, Bishop Amat's belated contention that the apostolic college had never been properly established and that he had direct jurisdiction over the Santa Barbara friars since their community numbered less than twelve stood on equally uncertain grounds. The bishop himself had dealt with the institution as a properly established apostolic college until he returned from Rome in 1861 when rumors of the friars' triumphalism seemed to change his mind. The documentation of the founding of the institution, especially

XUM

the Roman notations which designated it as an apostolic missionary college and the corroborating testimony of the intentions of the founders given by Archbishop Alemany disproved the bishop's contention. But Amat consistently refused to be convinced. Even after his ambiguous acceptance of Alemany's testimony on April 22, 1862,[60] the bishop continued to doubt the authority of González Rubio and his successor José María Romo to grant dimissorial letters. Perhaps another decisive verdict from Rome in the matter would have convinced Amat. The lack of such a decision is certainly lamentable, but the appointment of Archbishop Alemany as the apostolic visitor, after Amat had registered his opinion that Alemany was blatantly pro-Franciscan, would seem to indicate that Rome was aware of the documentary weakness of Amat's contentions. One writer has succinctly described the larger ramifications of the apostolic college controversy and the essence of its indecisive conclusion in these words:

> Rome probably took the view, especially with Alemany as apostolic visitor close to the scene, that in time things would settle down and that Santa Barbara with its religious, moral, ethnic, social, economic and political problems would survive and reform.[61]

NOTES

CHAPTER IX

[1]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, April 5, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:2 (October, 1950), 29.

[2]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, April 8, 1861, SBMA.

[3]Geiger points out the "humility as well as humiliation expressed in this letter." Geiger, op. cit., p. 30.

[4]Amat to González Rubio, Los Angeles, April 18, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

[5]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, April 22, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

[6]Amát to Gonzalez Rubio, Santa Barbara, May 4, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 33.

[7]González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, May 17, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:4 (April, 1951), 82-84.

[8]Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, May 4, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:2 (October, 1950), 33.

[9]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, May 5, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:3 (January, 1951), 53-55.

[10]For a treatment of the bulls of Pope Innocent XI in regard to the apostolic colleges cf. Saiz Diez, Los Colegios de Propaganda Fide, pp. 24-30, 56-62.

[11]This translation is found in Geiger, op. cit., pp. 53-55.

[12]Weber gives a clear summary of the essence of this dispute in these words: "Amat contended that the Santa Barbara foundation was a convent and not a college and was, therefore, subject to his jurisdiction. This contention was denied by the friars who considered their establishment an apostolic college, which, it would seem from the evidence, was actually the case." Weber, California's Reluctant Prelate, p. 64.

[13]Cf. Saiz Diez, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

[14]Amat to González Rubio, Santa Barbara, May 7, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

[15]The initial letters which Alemany sent to Pope Pius IX and Propaganda Fide to seek permission for the Franciscans to found the institution were annotated by Roman officials to indicate that they understood the petitions were for the foundation of an apostolic missionary college. cf. chap. vii, note 3, above. This directly contradicts Bishop Amat's contention that only the foundation of a convent was approved by Rome.

[16]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, May 10, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 56-58.

[17]González Rubio was correct in his analysis of the word "seu." cf. D.P. Simpson (ed.), Cassell's New Latin Dictionary (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1959), p. 558.

[18]González Rubio to Montefranco, Santa Barbara, May 17, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIII:4 (April, 1951), 82-84.

[19]Amat to González Rubio, San Luis Obispo, May 21, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 81-82.

[20]Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, June 8, 1861, PAR, vol. 19. Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, June 25, 1861, PAR, vol. 19. Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, July 8, 1861, PAR, vol. 19. Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, July 20, 1861, PAR, vol. 19. Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, August 10, 1861, PAR, vol. 19.

[21]Montefranco to Barnabò, Rome, July 19, 1861, PAR, vol. 19.

[22]Propaganda Fide, Rome, June 14, 1861, PAR, vol. 6.

[23]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, August 27, 1861, AABA. Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, August 27, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIV:1 (July, 1951), 5.

[24]Amat to Barnabò, Los Angeles, September 2, 1861, PAR, vol. 19. Regarding the appointment of Alemany, Weber writes: "In retrospect, it would seem that Rome made a poor selection in Alemany since it was he who had been instrumental in bringing about the foundation in the first place and he could scarcely be expected, therefore, to be objective." Weber, op. cit., p. 67.

[25]Amat to Alemany, Los Angeles, September 3, 1861, PAR, vol. 19.

[26]González Rubio to Alemany, Santa Barbara, September 4, 1861, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 3-5.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, September 4, 1861, PAR, vol. 19.

[29]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, September 10, 1861, PAR, vol. 19.

[30]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, September 22, 1861, AALA.

[31]Amat to Alemany, Los Angeles, October 26, 1861, AALA.

[32]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, February 18, 1862, AALA. Weber, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

[33]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, February 18, 1862, PAR, vol. 19.

[34]Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, February 19, 1862, PAR, vol. 19.

[35]Amat to Alemany, Los Angeles, March 10, 1862, AALA.

[36]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, April 10, 1862, AALA.

[37]Amat to Alemany, Los Angeles, April 22, 1862, AALA. Regarding this reply, Weber writes: "Amat's response was surprising, considering that he had apparently seen identical documentation from the mission archives." Weber, op. cit., p. 68.

[38]Regarding Amat's charges, Weber states: "Both of these statements were obviously unfounded, for it is doubtful that the Franciscans ever tried to establish themselves as an independent authority; nor did the friars act without the knowledge of their general, as was evidenced by earlier documentation." Weber, op. cit., p. 69.

[39]Carrillo to Stearns, Santa Barbara, June 6, 1861. Cited in Pitt, The Decline of the Californios, p. 244.

[40]Pitt, op. cit., p. 245.

[41]Ibid., pp. 246-247. cf. Robert G. Cleland, The Cattle of a Thousand Hills (2d ed.; San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1951), pp. 125-137.

[42]Pitt, op. cit., p. 234.

[43]For further information on Judge Benjamin Hayes cf. Hogue, "A History of Religion," pp. 62-65, 68-71, 115-121, 169-173.

[44]Pitt, op. cit., pp. 234-239. Pitt erroneously states that José de la Guerra had a part in his son Pablo's campaign. ibid., p. 238. The elder De la Guerra died four and a half years earlier on February 11, 1858. cf. Thompson, El Gran Capitán, pp. 139-150.

[45]Although Archbishop Alemany, another close associate of the Santa Barbara Franciscans, refused to bow to Unionist pressure to fly American flags from the churches of his archdiocese, he too was personally aligned with the Unionist cause. cf. McGloin, California's First Archbishop, pp. 178-182, 354.

[46]Propaganda Fide to Amat, Rome, July 10, 1862, SBMA.

[47]Amat to González Rubio, Los Angeles, February 10, 1863, SBMA.

[48]González Rubio to Franciscan Minister General, Santa Barbara, April 29, 1863, FCR.

[49]Ponticulo to González Rubio, Rome, June 30, 1863, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 6.

[50]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, September 21, 1864, SBMA. This translation is found in Geiger, op. cit., p. 7.

[51]Amat, Los Angeles, October 12, 1864, SBMA. Geiger, loc. cit.

[52]Amat, San Francisco, February 6, 1865, PAR, vol. 20. The school for boys will be treated in the next chapter.

[53]O'Keefe was received into the Franciscans at Santa Barbara on August 4, 1860. Wade was received there on July 21, 1863. cf. Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 408.

[54]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, January 16, 1868, SBMA. Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, January 16, 1868, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:1 (October, 1951), 22.

[55]Amat to González Rubio, Los Angeles, February 17, 1868, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 23.

[56]Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 415.

[57]Cf. Abesio to Romo, Rome, February 13, 1873, SBMA. Amat to Romo, Los Angeles, April 3, 1873, SBMA. Romo to Amat, Santa Barbara, April 14, 1873, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:3 (January, 1953), 42-46.

[58]Amat to Romo, Los Angeles, April 21, 1873, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

[59]Cleland, op. cit., p. 183.

[60]Cf. note 37, above.

[61]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 181. For information regarding the later years of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows which was closed on May 5, 1885 cf. ibid., pp. 200-204, and the remaining articles entitled "The Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Santa Barbara, California (1853-1885)," by Maynard Geiger, which continued to appear serially in Provincial Annals from XV:3 (January, 1953) to XIX:3 (January, 1957).

CHAPTER X

THE LAST YEARS (1862-1875)

The last years of José González Rubio's work in California were directed primarily to the sustenance, operation, and defense of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows. This was his central responsibility as the institution's president. The successful execution of this task meant, in essence, the preservation of Franciscanism in California through the difficult process of religious and cultural evolution which occurred in the 1850's and 1860's. In addition to the ongoing controversy and negotiations with Bishop Amat regarding the status of the apostolic college, González Rubio's work entailed other related concerns. One of these concerns was the proper resolution of the actual ownership and control of the Santa Barbara Mission property.

In December of 1855, the general claims of Archbishop Alemany to buildings and land at each of the twenty-one missions of California, in the name of the Catholic Church, had been upheld by the United States Board of Land Commissioners.[1] But the individual declarations of land decisions in regard to specific missions came at various times after this initial verdict. The formal deed granting the Santa Barbara Mission and about 280 acres of land at the mission to the Catholic Church was signed by President Abraham Lincoln on March 18, 1865.[2] By this time, of course, the legal representative of the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles, where Santa Barbara Mission is located, was Bishop Amat. He, therefore, received the deed to the mission and filed it in the Santa Barbara County courthouse early in 1867.[3]

As soon as the title to Santa Barbara Mission had been cleared by President Lincoln's decree, José González Rubio began to agitate for the transference of the deed to the Franciscans. He argued that, in the exchange of the mission for the downtown property of the apostolic college which had been executed between the Franciscans and Bishop Amat in 1856, the friars had given Bishop Amat the deed to the downtown property while they had received only perpetual use of the mission.[4] This, González Rubio held, was understandable in light of the fact that title to the Santa Barbara Mission property had not yet been confirmed by the United States Government in 1856. But after the deed had been secured, he asserted that it should be given to the Franciscans by the bishop to satisfy the demands of justice. Archbishop Alemany was enlisted to press the friars' case, but he could not convince Bishop Amat who insisted that the mission was now the property of the Holy See and was to be administered and held by the bishop of the diocese. Alemany disagreed with Amat's contention and backed the Franciscans' right to ownership of the mission property.[5]

In 1869 González Rubio made another concerted attempt to cause Bishop Amat to concede the ownership of Mission Santa Barbara to the Franciscans. In March of that year, he informed Archbishop Alemany that Bishop Amat was still adamant in his refusal to do so and went on to clarify the legal aspects of such a concession.[6] Displaying a commendable knowledge of canon law, the friar asserted that, according to the decrees of Popes Nicholas III and Clement V, Franciscan property and goods were really the possessions of the Roman Pontiffs, but they were to be held and administered by the Franciscan Order, through the agency of duly appointed syndics, and not by the bishops of the dioceses in which they might be located. González Rubio adverted to the necessity for the Franciscans to hold the deed to the mission property because of the legal procedures of the United States

XUM

which held that possession of property was open to question if the occupants could not produce legal certification of ownership. Fearing such a situation was dangerous to the security of the apostolic college, González Rubio urged Archbishop Alemany to settle the case in favor of the friars by allowing them to come into possession of the deed of ownership for Santa Barbara Mission.

Alemany answered González Rubio's request on April 8, 1869, stating that Bishop Amat still refused to transfer the mission deed to the Franciscans on the basis that Franciscan property was the possession of the Holy See through the agency of the bishop of the diocese.[7] On April 26, 1869, González Rubio made a last attempt at stating the friars' case in a letter to Archbishop Alemany in which he treated the details of the property exchange of 1856 and once again reviewed the Church teaching regarding the property of religious orders, claiming that it was the possession of the Holy See to be held and administered by the syndic of the religious order, not the bishop of the diocese.[8] As practical proof of this state of affairs in regard to Santa Barbara Mission, the friar asserted that "even the government of this country so judges of the matter and acts accordingly, for the taxes and contributions which are levied on the property have never been collected from Bishop Amat but from our syndic."[9] In closing, González Rubio asserted that he was not motivated by "sordid interest" in the matter but by a desire to protect and maintain the laws of the Franciscan Order and the rights of the Holy See.

But Bishop Amat remained unswayed by both González Rubio and Archbishop Alemany. After 1869 the friar lodged no more protests and Bishop Amat retained possession of Santa Barbara Mission in the name of the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles. It was not until 1925 that the Franciscans were awarded the deed to the mission by John J. Cantwell,

Bishop of Los Angeles and San Diego.[10]

Another project which occupied José González Rubio in the later years of his long career in California was the founding of a school for boys at Santa Barbara Mission. As early as 1862 Bishop Amat and the friar had speculated about the possibility of opening such an institution at the mission and staffing it with personnel from the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows. Bishop Amat saw the need for such a school and felt that the revenues derived from it could help support the Santa Barbara friars.[11] It will be recalled that the lack of financial resources in Santa Barbara was one of the main sources of tension between the friars and the bishop. José González Rubio received the bishop's suggestion with enthusiasm, stating that if the school was a source of financial support to the Franciscans it would serve to eliminate the constant economic pressures of maintaining the apostolic college and would provide a channel for the friars to be of service to the larger community.[12]

During 1863 and most of 1864, when Southern California was suffering the effects of floods and drought, no more mention of the school project was made by the bishop or the friars. At the end of 1864, Bishop Amat once again broached the subject of the school to González Rubio in these words:

> The bishop needs for his diocese religious communities for the education of youth which is being lost for lack of religious instruction. Why, therefore, could not your community dedicate itself to this work from which so great a benefit will accrue to religion and which will give to your community a means for its support and its development so that you will no longer be obliged to go from house to house begging for alms which is contrary to the spirit and taste of Americans, Protestants especially, whose numbers are increasing daily.[13]

Once again Father González Rubio's response to the bishop's

request was affirmative.[14] But this time the friar took concrete action to effect the founding of the school by commencing fund-raising activity. During 1865, Father Bernardine Sheehan of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, who had been ordained a Franciscan priest by Bishop Amat on December 21, 1864, traveled throughout Northern California soliciting donations to be used for the building renovations necessary for the establishment of the school at Santa Barbara Mission.[15]

During 1866 and 1867, preparations for the opening of the Franciscan School for Boys, or Colegio Franciscano, continued as funds were applied to the renovation of portions of the Santa Barbara Mission which would be used for the new institution. The section of the mission where the school was to be located was in the front wing, primarily on the second floor.[16] Further improvements in the section of the mission where the school was located were commissioned by González Rubio in the summer of 1870, two years after the institution had commenced operating.[17] Although some primary level courses were taught, the principal function of the Franciscan College was to provide a high school and junior college level curriculum.[18] On March 2, 1868, the Franciscan College commenced its operation. The nature of the institution at its inception was explained in its first official prospectus, dated March, 1868, in the following words:

> "Prospectus of the Franciscan College,
> Santa Barbara, California
>
> "This establishment, conducted by the Fathers of the Order of St. Francis, opened for the reception of students on the 2nd of March, 1868. It is situated less than 1 mile from the City of Santa Barbara, commanding a splendid view of the surrounding country, the ocean and adjacent islands, and possessing the advantage of a climate proverbially mild, salubrious, and in all respects superior to any on the Pacific Coast.

"The object of the Institution is to give a good English, Classical, Mathematical, and Philosophical Education at the lowest possible cost,--a want long felt in California,--and thereby bring its advantages within the reach of all.

"The course of Studies embraces Grammar, Geography, History, Composition, Rhetoric, Elocution; the English, Spanish, Greek, and Latin languages; Arithmetic, Algebra, Bookkeeping, Plane and Solid Geometry, Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, Mensuration; Mental, Moral and Natural Philosophy.

"Terms for Boarders: Entrance fee, to be paid only once, $15.00; Tuition, Board, Washing, Bed and Bedding, per Session of Ten and one-half months, $150.00; Those who supply Bed, Bedding, and pay for Washing, will pay no entrance fee, and will only be charged per Session, $120.00; Parents will pay for Medicine, Medical Attendance, and provide their children with towels, brushes, combs, napkins, etc.; Those who spend vacation in the College will pay, $30.00.

"Terms for Day Scholars: Tuition in the Primary and Intermediate Departments, per month, $3.00; Tuition in the Higher Departments, per month, $4.00; Music, French, and German form extra charges. Payments must be made semi-annually in advance. No deduction will be made for temporary absences. A sufficient sum of money must be deposited with the Treasurer to pay for books, stationary, etc., which will be supplied by the College at store prices. The College will not purchase clothing, unless a sufficient sum be deposited for that purpose. Although the Institution is Catholic, students of any religious denomination will be received, provided they comply with the rules of the establishment. The scholastic year begins on the 16th of August, and ends about the 25th of June."[19]

In the summer of 1868, the San Francisco Catholic newspaper, The Monitor, ran two articles on the Franciscan School for Boys at Santa Barbara. The first, dated June 6, 1868, reviewed the perseverence of the Franciscans in planning and founding the much-needed institution and gave special praise to the work of Father José González Rubio.[20] The second, which appeared on August 8, 1868, adverted to the great need in California for the school "whose terms would admit

the sons of the toiling masses, as well as those of the millionaire."[21] Thirty-four students enrolled in the school in the first semester. The student body doubled by the end of 1868 to total seventy students, including thirty who were boarders. During the nine-year existence of the Franciscan College, which was forced to close in 1877 due to increasing debts, almost three hundred boys were enrolled in the institution.[22] By 1873 the boarding students were coming from all over California, and as far away as Virginia City, Nevada, and Salt Lake City, Utah.[23] In 1868 the student body was almost evenly balanced between students of Hispanic and Anglo-American backgrounds, but by 1874, the Anglo-American students were significantly in the majority.[24]

Although the Franciscan College and the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows were totally distinct institutions, from 1868 to 1877 they shared the buildings and facilities of the Santa Barbara Mission. And, although Father González Rubio had no direct responsibility for the School for Boys, he lived in the school's environment at the mission from 1868 until his death in 1875.[25] A remarkable picture of life at the Franciscan College between 1869 and 1874 was sketched by a former student of the institution, Felipe Estolano Larios, in his memoirs.[26] Larios spoke of the affability of the Franciscan friars at the mission, the picnics and social events, the athletic contests, the feuds and fighting, and the pranks which he and his fellow students perpetrated. Recalling his continuing relationship with Father González Rubio, Larios gave the following brief account: "I often sat on the bench in the corridor and talked to him. He had been my father's friend in the earlier days and liked to talk to me about my father's family."[27] This picture of González Rubio is similar to the one sketched by the youthful William Heath Davis more than thirty years earlier.[28] In both,

the friar was portrayed as seeking the company and conversation of the young. But the reminiscence of Larios indicated a man who, in his later years, was content to dwell on the remembrances of friends from years gone by who had lived in a California which had all but passed away. It is a personal and human vignette which captures for a brief moment the quiet reality of González Rubio's private musings in the midst of his otherwise active life as priest and administrator.

In the fall of 1869, a San Francisco newspaper reporter who had paid a recent visit to Santa Barbara Mission left another portrayal of José González Rubio. He erroneously stated that the priest was eighty years old and had been in California for more than fifty years.[29] In fact, at that time, González Rubio was sixty-four years of age and had been in California a little more than thirty-six years. After these initial inaccuracies the article went on to describe the friar in these words:

> He must have been a fine-looking man when in his prime, for even today, he has the impress of nobility. His full black eye is still clear and benevolent; his well-shaped head, covered with silver gray hair, and his tall, wiry frame, slightly stooping under the weight of years, bespeak a man of great mental and physical vigor. But, notwithstanding the ravages of time and the privations inseparable from the life of the early missionary priest, Father González's mental vigor is still unimpaired, and he superintends his pastoral charge as minutely and actively as in days agone. Santa Barbara can consider itself blessed in having such pious, zealous, and affable priests to look after its spiritual welfare.[30]

An adjunct of González Rubio's concern to maintain the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows and the Franciscan ministry in California was the recruitment of new personnel for the institution. It will be recalled that the sending of additional friars to work in the apostolic college was one of the recommendations of Propaganda Fide in their resolution of the Amat-Franciscan dispute

issued on February 13, 1860.[31] In 1861 González Rubio had corresponded with the Franciscan Minister General asking that the new friars be sent quickly and that a qualified candidate be among them to succeed him as president of the apostolic college.[32] Although it had been Minister General Montefranco's understanding in 1860 that the expenses for transporting the new friars to California would not be borne by the Franciscan Order, by 1861 it had become clear that the financial support for such a project was not forthcoming from any other quarter.[33] In January of 1862, Archbishop Alemany wrote to Montefranco asking that something more be done to supply the needed new friars to the apostolic college.[34] But on May 17, 1862, Montefranco reported to Annabile Capalti, Secretary of Propaganda Fide, that he had done everything possible to prepare a group of Franciscans for the Santa Barbara assignment and then had been forced to send them elsewhere due to a lack of funds for their transportation to California.[35] In August of the same year, Alemany requested Bishop Amat to bear some of the transportation costs for the new Franciscans, but Amat answered that he was both unwilling and unable to do so since he also was in financial difficulty.[36] On September 1, 1862, Bishop Amat informed Cardinal Barnabò of Propaganda Fide of his financial inability to aid in the transportation of the new Franciscans and the Cardinal answered that Propaganda Fide would consider funding the project if the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles would repay the money at a later date.[37]

In August of 1863, José González Rubio once again renewed his request for additional Franciscan personnel to the Franciscan Minister General, stating that such action was in accord with the Propaganda Fide decree of 1860 and and asking specifically that a priest be sent to relieve him of the presidency of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows.[38] In the following month, on September 11, 1863,

Archbishop Alemany sent a similar request to the Franciscan Minister General, pointing out the struggles and poverty of the Santa Barbara friars and their need to be refreshed by the addition of new personnel to their institution.[39] For the remainder of the decade all discussion of this project ceased and it never materialized, most probably because of the lack of financial resources which plagued all of Southern California after the floods and droughts of 1862-63 to which both Bishop Amat and the Franciscans were subject.

By 1870 the health and vitality which José González Rubio had once enjoyed began to wane. In that year he once again petitioned the Franciscan Minister General for new Franciscan personnel for the apostolic college and especially for a successor to the office of the presidency which he had occupied since 1858.[40] The Minister General responded affirmatively to the latter half of González Rubio's request when, on March 29, 1871, he gave the obedience to Father José Romo, a Mexican Franciscan then working in Port Said, Egypt, to proceed to Santa Barbara as the future successor to González Rubio in the office of president of the apostolic college.[41] The Minister General told Father Romo that González Rubio's health and eyesight were beginning to fail and that the Santa Barbara friar anxiously awaited his help.

On the following day, March 30, 1871, the Franciscan Minister General sent a letter to González Rubio informing the friar of his action in regard to Romo and his inability to provide further assistance.[42] The following is a summary of the Minister General's remarks:

> On March 30, 1871, the Minister General wrote to González Rubio stating that owing to conditions in Italy, where the friars had been disturbed in their convents for five years and where no receptions to the Order had taken place in ten, he could naturally not send any priests to Santa Barbara. He

> found one man, however, whom he called a worthy religious, pious and learned, who had the spirit of humility, obedience and sacrifice, in the person of Father José María de Jesús Romo, a Mexican Franciscan who had been guardian of the College of Zacatecas and who had spent some years in the custody of the Holy Land. Him he was sending to González Rubio as a helper and as his successor in in office.[43]

Father Romo arrived in Santa Barbara on January 21, 1872, and received a warm welcome from the Franciscan community at the apostolic college.[44] During the winter of 1872, he was initiated into the workings of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows and introduced to the city and people of Santa Barbara by Father González Rubio. It was apparent that by this time relations between the diocesan priests of the city and the Franciscans were cordial and friendly.[45] González Rubio's health was failing so fast in these months that in April, 1872, Archbishop Alemany informed Cardinal Barnabò in Rome that the friar was weak and in such bad health that he feared for his life.[46]

On April 28, 1872, Father Bernardino a Portu Romantino, the Franciscan Minister General, officially appointed José Romo as González Rubio's successor to the superiorship of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows.[47] Whereas González Rubio had the title of president, Romo was given the title of guardian, but the office and the authority he assumed were the same as those exercised by González Rubio. The letters patent for Romo's appointment were received at Mission Santa Barbara on June 1, 1872 and on the following day the official appointment was read to the assembled Franciscan community in the college dining room.[48] After Romo's acceptance of the guardianship, José González Rubio was given the second place in the community and awarded the title of chronologist as a sign of the honor and esteem in which the community held him.[49]

On June 7, 1872, Father Romo informed Bishop Amat

of the changes in the administration of the apostolic college and three days later the prelate sent a warm reply to the new superior telling him that he could count on the bishop's support and co-operation "in everything which is conducive to the good, growth and prosperity of your respectable community."[50] In addition, the bishop expressed solicitude for the delicate health of Father González Rubio saying that he would not cease praying for the life and health of the friar.

On November 29, 1872, Father González Rubio, in spite of his ill health, said his customary daily Mass. It was the last time he was ever to officiate at the altar. In the morning of the following day, November 30, 1872, the friar was stricken grievously ill, most probably with a stroke. His situation was so grave that Father Romo administered the Last Rites of the Church to him.[51] But González Rubio partially recovered from the seemingly fatal attack, although he was greatly weakened and his eyesight failed so badly as to render him almost blind. In this condition the friar survived for another three years, bearing his infirmities patiently, enjoying the company of his confreres at the apostolic college and the Franciscan Boys School, and devoting much time to meditation and prayer.[52]

By October of 1875, it had become apparent that González Rubio's death was imminent. In light of this, a group of Santa Barbara citizens drew up a document in which they pledged contributions toward the purchase of the friar's casket. The words of this document, which were the last testimonial to the friar during his lifetime from the people of Santa Barbara, read as follows:

> Knowing that the Reverend Father José María de Jesús González Rubio, after his great suffering, is drawing near to the hour when he must respond to the call of the Lord and desiring to manifest one more time the appreciation and affection which we have professed during his life for his worthy and

> great merits, virtues, and example, as priest and missionary, we the undersigned promise to contribute, at the moment we are informed of his death, the sums which appear alongside of our respective names, to be used to buy at our expense the casket in which his body is to lie.[53]

Thirty-two signatures were affixed to the document and the pledges totaled $132.75.

In the following month, on November 2, 1875, at 4:45 P. M., José González Rubio died. At the moment of his death he was lying on a mattress on the floor of his room, with Father Romo kneeling by his side reading the prayers for the dying, while other members of the Franciscan community recited the rosary.[54] Father Romo concluded his entry concerning González Rubio's death in the mission register in the words:

> Finally, with the fame of uncommon virtues especially with that of prudence and exquisite tact in governing, deeply mourned by the whole population of Santa Barbara, and much more by his brethren in the Order, and after a long and painful illness, the result of paralysis, and fortified by the spiritual aides, he peacefully surrendered his soul to his Creator at this College.[55]

The funeral services for José González Rubio were held in the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows at the request of Bishop Amat who, although he was in attendance, forbade a funeral sermon to be preached.[56] Great crowds attended both the funeral services at the downtown church and the Requiem Mass which was celebrated at Santa Barbara Mission by Father Jayme Vila before the casket was placed in the vaults of the mission church. On November 8 of that year it was removed and placed in the new community vaults which had been constructed in the mission cemetery.[58]

XUM

NOTES

CHAPTER X

[1]Engelhardt, Santa Barbara Mission, p. 350. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 241.

[2]Abraham Lincoln, Washington, D.C., March 18, 1865, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., pp. 352-353. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:2 (January, 1953), 41.

[3]Deed to Santa Barbara Mission, Santa Barbara, February 12, 1867, SBMA. Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 242.

[4]Cf. chap. vii, note 32, above.

[5]Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, n.d., PAR vol. 23.

[6]González Rubio to Alemany, Santa Barbara, March, 1869, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:2 (January, 1952), 42-44.

[7]Alemany to González Rubio, San Francisco, April 8, 1869, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., p. 44.

[8]González Rubio to Alemany, Santa Barbara, April 26, 1869, SBMA. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 44-49.

[9]Ibid. This translation is found in Geiger, loc. cit.

[10]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 242.

[11]Amat to Barnabò, Los Angeles, September 1, 1862, PAR, vol. 19.

[12]González Rubio, blotter, Santa Barbara, n.d., 1862, SBMA.

[13]Amat to González Rubio, Los Angeles, December 21, 1864, SBMA. Translated in Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIV:1 (July, 1951), 8.

[14]González Rubio to Amat, Santa Barbara, January 2, 1865. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[15]Sheehan to González Rubio, San Francisco, February 7, 1865, SBMA. Sheehan to Fox, Mendocino City, October 18, 1865, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:1 (October, 1952), 21.

[16]Geiger, Mission Santa Barbara, p. 188.

[17]Ibid., p. 189.

[18]For more information on the Franciscan School for Boys cf. ibid., pp. 188-199. Hogue, "A History of Religion," pp. 244-246.

[19]Prospectus of the Franciscan College, Santa Barbara, California, March, 1868, SBMA.

[20]"New Catholic College at Santa Barbara," The Monitor (San Francisco), June 6, 1868.

[21]"Franciscan College, Santa Barbara," The Monitor (San Francisco), August 8, 1868.

[22]Geiger, op. cit., pp. 188-189.

[23]Prospectus of the Franciscan College, Santa Barbara, California, 1873 (Santa Barbara: Times Co., 1873).

[24]Prospectus of the Franciscan College, Santa Barbara, California, 1873 (Santa Barbara: Russell and Co., 1874).

[25]Although González Rubio worked for the establishment of the Franciscan College (School for Boys), his work at the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows prevented him from exercising any office in the new institution. Father Bernardine Sheehan was the first president of the Franciscan College. He was succeeded by Father Joseph J. O'Keefe. Both were alumni of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, cf. Geiger, loc. cit.

[26]Larios's grandfather had come to California in 1776 with the Anza expedition. Felipe Estolano Larios was born in 1855 on the Santa Ana Rancho, near Hollister, California. In May of 1938, Larios, then eighty-four years old, personally presented a copy of his memoirs to the Reverend Maynard Geiger at Santa Barbara Mission. cf. Geiger, op. cit., pp. 192-199. Felipe Estolano Larios, "Santa Barbara School Days," ed. Maynard Geiger, Noticias, occasional papers, (n. 3, 1964).

[27]Larios, op. cit., p. 8.

[28]Cf. chap. iii, note 73, above.

[29]"San Francisco to San Diego," The Monitor (San Francisco), October 23, 1869.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Cf. chap. viii, notes 44, 45, above.

[32]Cf. chap. ix, note 18, above.

[33]Cf. chap. viii, note 46, chap. ix, note 20, above.

[34]Alemany to Montefranco, San Francisco, January 18, 1862, FCR.

[35]Montefranco to Capalti, Rome, May 17, 1862, PAR, vol. 19. cf. Propaganda Fide to Alemany, blotter, Rome, July 2, 1862, SBMA.

[36]Alemany to Amat, San Francisco, August 24, 1862, AALA. Amat to Alemany, Los Angeles, August 30, 1862, AALA.

[37]Amat to Barnabò, Los Angeles, September 1, 1867, PAR, vol. 19. Barnabò to Amat, Rome, December 2, 1862, AALA.

[38]González Rubio to Ponticulo, Santa Barbara, August 12, 1863, FCR.

[39]Alemany to Ponticulo, Santa Barbara, September 1, 1863, FCR.

[40]Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 414.

[41]Minister General to Romo, Rome, March 29, 1871, SBMA.

[42]Romantino to González Rubio, Rome, March 30, 1971, SBMA.

[43]Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XV:1 (October, 1952), 25.

[44]Romo to Romantino, Santa Barbara, January 26, 1872, SBMA. Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 415.

[45]Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XIV:4 (April, 1952), 66-67.

[46]Alemany to Barnabò, San Francisco, April 2, 1872, PAR, vol. 24.

[47]Romantino, Rome, April 28, 1872, SBMA.

XUM

[48]Ab Aesio to González Rubio, Rome, May 3, 1872, SBMA. Engelhardt, loc. cit.

[49]Engelhardt, op. cit., p. 416.

[50]Amat to Romo, Los Angeles, June 10, 1872, SBMA.

[51]Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 35.

[52]Ibid.

[53]List of donors, Santa Barbara, October, 1875, SBMA.

[54]Geiger, loc. cit.

[55]Libro de Difuntos, Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Santa Barbara, November 2, 1875, SBMA. Translated in Geiger, loc. cit.

[56]Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, p. 118.

[57]Romo to Minister General, Santa Barbara, January 14, 1876, SBMA. Geiger, "The Apostolic College," Provincial Annals, XVI:2 (October, 1953), 35.

[58]Geiger, op. cit., p. 36.

XUM

EPILOGUE

The life and work of José González Rubio bespeak a man who was true to the ideals of his vocation and his religious faith as he labored for the Catholic Church in California through a period of almost unceasing social and political change. During his years as missionary at Mission San José he worked to maintain the physical and spiritual well-being of the Indians despite the vacillation in mission policy caused by the advent of secularization under the Mexican government. His concern for the rights of the Indians and their reciprocal high regard for him, as well as his administrative ability, earned González Rubio appointment as president and vice commissary-prefect of the Zacatecan missions in 1837 and 1840.

Acting in these official capacities, González Rubio was careful to provide for the delicate transfer of ecclesiastical property and authority upon the arrival of Francisco García Diego as the first Bishop of the Californias in 1841. This knowledge of and concern for proper Church polity brought González Rubio to the bishop's household as García Diego's secretary and allowed the friar to broaden his knowledge of ecclesiastical administration and the actual state of the Catholic Church throughout California.

In retrospect, the acquisition of such experience seems providential. For, in 1846, on the eve of the American occupation of California, González Rubio shouldered the burden of administering the Catholic Church in both Californias. In a very concrete sense, the friar was the savior of the Catholic Church in the uncertain years between 1846 and 1850. He brought priests to minister to the growing population; secured the holy oils used in the administration of certain sacraments; taught the faithful in his private ministry and in circular letters; negotiated with the American authorities concerning the status of the

Catholic Church under the new regime, and used his diplomacy to ease the Church into the new pluralistic culture which was emerging in California. His intelligence and integrity made him a respected spokesman for the Church and her interests during these transitional years and preserved the episcopal dignity and authority intact until Bishop Alemany arrived to shepherd the Church into the American era. All this González Rubio accomplished without the benefit of episcopal rank.

From 1851 to 1858, González Rubio served as vicar general for both Archbishop Alemany and Bishop Amat, facilitating the transformation of the California Catholic Church from a missionary organization to a part of the Catholic Church in the United States. So great was the admiration and respect of the people of Santa Barbara for the friar in these years that they prevented his recall back to Mexico in the "benevolent kidnapping" of 1856. González Rubio served as Alemany's primary source of information regarding the history of Church lands in California, helped the Archbishop in filing the Church's claims with the United States Land Commission, and steadfastly insisted that mission lands had been the sole property of the Indians.

After 1858, González Rubio's activity consisted primarily in administering the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows as its president and in representing the Franciscan community at Santa Barbara in the ongoing controversies with Bishop Amat. These controversies, especially because of the interruption of his public ministry from September of 1858 to April of 1861 and the delay in the ordination of new Franciscan priests, caused González Rubio much frustration in his later years.

There is no simple solution to the riddle of the Amat-Franciscan controversies. They were the product of an intricate web of historical, personal, cultural, religious, economic, and ethnic factors. Certainly Bishop

XUM

Amat had a right and a duty to exercise his authority as teacher of the faithful and admonish them when he felt that they were falling short of the demands of Christian morality. But his admonitions came to the Spanish-speaking Catholics from the lips of a stranger and they resented what they felt was an attempt to Americanize their faith. This was too much to bear in light of the oppression which they already were receiving at American hands. Hence they fastened upon the Franciscan Catholicism which had been the legacy of their Hispanic heritage in an attempt to withstand further encroachment on their cultural and ethnic integrity. Bishop Amat failed to consider these larger ramifications and, spurred on by the anti-Franciscan attitudes of Father Cajetan Sorrentini, laid the blame for the dissension at the door of the Franciscans.

Perhaps the controversy could have been ended in 1858, but the biased methods of Father Francisco Caro, the apostolic visitor, in carrying out his investigation seemed to have rendered the bishop incapable of granting the Santa Barbara Franciscans any quarter from then on. It is important to note that the bulk of anti-Franciscan testimony in the case revolved around a moral condemnation of the Santa Barbara populace and certain Mexican Franciscans in California. No charge of theological or moral impropriety on the part of any member of the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows was ever seriously considered, and certainly none was proved.

The issue, in essence, was a cultural, ethnic, and economic one. The bishop and his clergy were bent on cultivating a Catholicism in the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles which was free from the cultural and ethnic characteristics of Mexican Catholicism. Amat felt that the public processions and private devotionalism of Mexican Catholicism would precipitate anti-Catholic feeling among the new American Protestant inhabitants of Santa Barbara.

In addition, the prelate thought that this type of religion was only external in nature and, therefore, he blamed the immorality of certain Hispanic inhabitants of Santa Barbara on its lack of substance.

Another aspect of Mexican Catholicism to which Bishop Amat objected was the Franciscan custom of begging in public. This activity was detrimental to the financial arrangement of the diocesan structure. The diocesan parish must survive on the contributions of its members, but the loyalty of the Spanish-speaking Catholics of Santa Barbara to the friars made it extremely difficult to maintain a parish in the town since they would not support it financially. For these reasons, Amat was determined that there should not be a divided ecclesiastical authority in Santa Barbara and, therefore, he attempted to render the Santa Barbara Franciscans subject to his authority, even though their constitution as an apostolic college guaranteed their independence. The transformation of this cultural and economic tension into a theological and jurisdictional dispute did not allow it to be solved by any verdict on the part of Roman authorities. For this reason it resulted in a stalemate and was settled only as Santa Barbara slowly grew into a part of the American commonwealth.

Throughout his forty-two year career in California, the reputation of González Rubio as a pious and learned priest, and a capable and diplomatic administrator, was never tarnished. Even the heat of the Amat-Franciscan controversies could not impugn his integrity. The testimony to the excellence of his character is universal. One writer has succinctly summarized this consistent evaluation of José González Rubio in these words:

> None knew him but to love the man. Whether in his Church or among those of different religions, his face wore the same benevolent, cheerful feeling. With him his religion was a golden cord, which ran through every action of his life, endearing himself to all, whether Protestant or Catholic.[1]

NOTES

EPILOGUE

[1]Jesse Diamond Mason, History of Santa Barbara County (Oakland: Thompson and West, 1883), p. 170. Quoted in Geiger, Franciscan Missionaries, p. 120.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

1. Manuscript Collections

Archives of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Originals in the chancery of the Archbishop of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California. Copies in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

Archives of the Archdiocese of San Francisco. Originals in the chancery of the Archbishop of San Francisco, San Francisco, California. Copies in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California, and the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

Archives of California. Transcripts in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Archives of the Franciscan Curia. Originals in Rome, Italy. Copies in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

Archives of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide. Originals in Rome, Italy. Copies in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

California Mission Documents, vol. III. Originals in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

De la Guerra Collection. Originals in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

Documents of the College of Our Lady of Sorrows. Originals in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

Huntington Library Collection. Originals in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. Copies in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives, Santa Barbara, California.

The Writings of Narciso Durán. Microfilm copy in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California.

2. Printed Sources

Concilia Provincilia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1851.

Concilium Plenarium Totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori Habitum. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1853.

Dana, Richard Henry. Two Years Before the Mast. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1959.

Davis, William Heath. Seventy-Five Years in California. San Francisco: John Howell, 1929.

El Criollo D.I.M.J.C.R.I.G. Relación Cristiana de los males que ha sufrido Guadalajara por los Insurgentes. Guadalajara: February 11, 1811.

Larios, Felipe Estolano. "Santa Barbara School Days (1869-1874)." Edited and with an introduction by Maynard Geiger. Noticias. (Occasional papers of the Santa Barbara Historical Society, No. 3), 1964.

Nunis, Doyce B., Jr. (ed.). The California Diary of Faxon Dean Atherton. San Francisco: California Historical Society, 1964.

Prospectus of the Franciscan College, Santa Barbara, California. Santa Barbara: Times Co., 1873.

Prospectus of the Franciscan College, Santa Barbara, California. Santa Barbara: Russell and Co., 1874.

Robinson, Alfred. Life in California. Santa Barbara: Peregrine Publishers, Inc., 1970.

Thomas, P.J. Our Centennial Memoir. San Francisco: Privately printed, 1877.

Wilbur, Marguerite Eyer. Duflot de Mofras' Travels on the Pacific Coast. Santa Ana, Calif.: The Fine Arts Press, 1937.

3. Newspapers

El Clamor Público (Los Angeles). 1856.

Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register (New York). 1858.

Santa Barbara Gazette. 1858.

The Alta California (San Francisco). 1854.

The Monitor (San Francisco). 1868.

XUM

Secondary Sources

1. Books

Alcocer, José Antonio. Bosquejo de la historia del Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe y sus Misiones. Mexico: Editorial Parrua, 1958.

Asencio, José. Origen de los Colegios Apostólicos. Guadalajara: Banco Industrial de Jalisco, S.A., 1947.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. History of California. 7 vols. San Francisco: A.L. Bancroft and Co., 1884-1890.

_____. Register of Pioneer Inhabitants of California 1542 to 1848. Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1964.

Barth, Pius Joseph. Franciscan Education and the Social Order in Spanish North America (1502-1821). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Bean, Walton. California: An Interpretative History. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968.

Billington, Ray Allen. The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860. Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1964.

Bolton, Herbert E. Wider Horizons of American History. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Cleland, Robert G. The Cattle on a Thousand Hills. 2nd ed. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1951.

Cornejo Franco, José. Guadalajara Colonial. Guadalajara: Edición de la camara nacional de comercio y industria de Guadalajara, 1938.

Doyle, John Thomas. The Case of the Pious Fund of California in the International Arbitral Court. San Francisco: G. Spaulding and Co., 1906.

Drury, Clifford M. A Chronology of Protestant Beginnings in California. San Francisco: Centennial Committee Northern California-Western Nevada Council of Churches, 1947.

Ellis, John Tracy. American Catholicism. 2nd ed. revised. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1969.

Engelhardt, Zephyrin. Mission Santa Ines. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Santa Barbara Mission, 1932.

_____. Missions and Missionaries of California. 4 vols. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1908-1915.

_____. Santa Barbara Mission. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co., 1923.

Esparza Sánchez, Cuahtemóc. Compendio histórico del Colegio Apostólico de Propaganda Fide de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas. Mexico: 1957.

Geary, Gerald J. The Secularization of the California Missions (1810-1846). Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1934.

Geiger, Maynard. Franciscan Missionaries in Hispanic California 1769-1848: A Biographical Dictionary. San Marino, Calif.: The Huntington Library, 1969.

_____. Mission Santa Barbara 1782-1965. Santa Barbara, Calif.: Santa Barbara Mission, 1965.

_____. The Life and Times of Fray Junípero Serra, O.F.M. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1959.

Guest, Francis F. Fermín Francisco de Lasuén (1736-1803): A Biography. Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1973.

Guilday, Peter. A History of the Councils of Baltimore 1791-1884. New York: MacMillan and Co., 1932.

Hamill, Hugh M. The Hidalgo Revolt. Gainesville, Fla.: The University of Florida Press, 1966.

Hansen, Woodrow J. The Search for Authority in California 1820-1849. Oakland: Biobooks, 1960.

Haring, C.H. The Spanish Empire in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1947.

Hittell, Theodore H. History of California. 4 vols. San Francisco: N.J. Stone and Co., 1885-1897.

Hurley, Mark J. Church-State Relationships in Education in California. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Hutchinson, C. Alan. Frontier Settlement in Mexican California. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Kenneally, Finbar. United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives: A Calendar. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Academy of American Franciscan History, 1966-1971.

Lyons, Mary Letitia. Francis Norbert Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Missions (1838-1848). Washington,

Mason Jesse Diamond. History of Santa Barbara County. Oakland: Thompson and West, 1883.

McCarthy, Frances Florence, and Raymund F. Wood. The History of Mission San Jose California 1797-1835. With an epilogue covering the period from 1835 to 1855. Fresno, Calif.: Academy Library Guild, 1958.

XUM

McGloin, John B. California's First Archbishop. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

_____. Jesuits by the Golden Gate: The Society of Jesus in San Francisco, 1849-1969. San Francisco: University of San Francisco, 1972.

McKittreck, Myrtle M. Vallejo, Son of California. Portland, Ore.: Binfords and Mort, 1944.

McWilliams, Carey. North from Mexico. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

North, William E. Catholic Education in Southern California. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1936.

O'Hara, Edwin V. Catholic History of Oregon. Portland, Ore.: Catholic Book Co., 1916.

Páez Brotchie, Luis. Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico. Guadalajara: 1951.

Palacio y Basave, Luis. Historia breve y compendiosa de Colegio Apostólico de Propaganda Fide de Nuestra Señora de Zapopan. Guadalajara: C.M. Sainz, 1925.

_____. Recopilación de noticias y datos que se relacionan con la milagrosa imagen de Nuestra Señora de Zapopan y con su colegio y santuario. Guadalajara: Talleres de Universidad de Guadalajara, 1942.

Pitt, Leonard. The Decline of the Californios. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

Priestly, Herbert I. José de Gálvez, Visitor-General of New Spain, 1765-1771. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1916.

Rahner, Karl and Herbert Vorgrimler. Theological Dictionary. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Riordan, Joseph W. The First Half Century of St. Ignatius Church and College. San Francisco: H.S. Crocker CO., 1905.

Rivera y Sanramon, Augustín. Los Hijos de Jalisco. 2nd ed. Guadalajara: Escuela de Artes i Oficios, 1897.

Romo de Vivar y Torres, Joaquín. Guadalajara. Guadalajara: Ediciones del Banco Industrial de Jalisco, S.A., 1964.

Saiz Diez, Felix. Los Colegios de Propaganda Fide en Hispanoamérica. Madrid: Raycar, S.A., 1969.

Simpson, D.P. (ed.). Cassell's New Latin Dictionary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1959.

Simpson, Lesley Bird. Many Mexicos. 3rd ed. revised. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.

Sotomayor, José Francisco. Historia del Apostólico Colegio de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas. Zacatecas: Manuel Ceniceros, 1889.

Steck, Francis Borgia. Ensayos historicos hispano-americanos. Mexico: 1940.

Thompson, Joseph. El Gran Capitán. Los Angeles: Cabrera and Sons, 1961.

Weber, Francis J. A biographical sketch of Right Reverend Francisco García Diego y Moreno. Los Angeles: The Borromeo Guild, 1961.

_____. A biographical sketch of Right Reverend Joseph Sadoc Alemany. Van Nuys, Calif.: California Historical Publications, 1961.

_____. California's Reluctant Prelate. Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1964.

_____. Francisco García Diego. Los Angeles: Dawson's Book Shop, 1971.

2. Articles

Adam, V.D. "The Pious Fund," Historical Society of Southern California, Annual Publications, IV (1897), 228-233.

Baur, Godfrey F. "González Rubio de la Sagrada Mitra de las Ambas Californias," Priestly Studies, XXII:3 (May, 1954), 107-129.

Engelhardt, Zephyrin. "The First Ecclesiastical Synod of California, March 19-23, 1852," Catholic Historical Review, I (April, 1905), 30-37.

Geiger, Maynard. "The Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows, Santa Barbara, California (1853-1885)," Provincial Annals, XI:2 (October, 1948)-XIX:3 (January, 1957).

_____. "The Detailed Story of the 'Kidnapping' of Father González Rubio, O.F.M.," Provincial Annals, VI:1 (January, 1946), 8-10.

_____. "The Very Rev. José María de Jesús González Rubio, O.F.M. (1804-1875)," Provincial Annals, VIII:1 (January, 1946), 29-33.

Hanchett, William. "The Question of Religion and the Taming of California, 1849-1854," California Historical Society Quarterly, XXXII (March and June, 1953), 49-56, 119-144.

Hurt, Peyton. "The Rise and Fall of the 'Know Nothings' in California," California Historical Society Quarterly, IX (March and June, 1930), 16-49, 99-128.

McGloin, John B. "California's First Archbishop: A Visit to Vich," American Ecclesiastical Review, CLXII (August, 1960), 112-116.

_____. "The California Catholic Church in Transition, 1846-1850," California Historical Society Quarterly, XLII (March, 1963), 39-48.

_____. "The Coming of Joseph Sadoc Alemany, O.P., Pioneer Prelate of El Dorado," Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, LXII:4 (December, 1951), 203-212.

Servín, Manuel P. "The Secularization of the California Missions: A Reappraisal," Southern California Quarterly, XLVII:2 (June, 1965), 133-151.

Tschan, Francis J. "The Catholic Church in the United States, 1852-1858," Records of the American Catholic Historical Society, LIX (June, 1948), 77-117.

Weber, Francis J. "Search for a Bishop," Southern California Quarterly, XLV (June, 1963), 8-14.

_____. "Thaddeus Amat-Fact versus Fiction," Records of the American Catholic Historical Society, LXXIV (September, 1963).

_____. "The Pious Fund of the Californias," Hispanic American Historical Review, XLIII (February, 1963), 78-94.

3. Unpublished Materials

Arentz, Theodore. "Apostolic College, Santa Barbara 1853-1885." Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara Mission Archives, n.d.

_____. "Sketch of Life of Very Rev. P. José María de Jesús González Rubio." Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara Mission Archives, 1911-1912.

Geiger, Maynard. "Calendar of Documents in the Santa Barbara Mission Archives." Revised edition. Santa Barbara Mission Archives, 1969. (Typewritten.)

Gray, Gertrude Mary. "A Preliminary Survey of the Life of the Most Reverend Joseph Sadoc Alemany, First Archbishop of San Francisco." Unpublished Master's thesis, Pacific Coast Branch of the Catholic University of America, 1942.

Habig, Marion. "Franciscan Apostolic Colleges in Hispanic America." Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara Mission Archives, n.d.

Hessel, Josephine A. "The History of the Catholic Church in Los Angeles." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Southern California, 1937.

Hogue, Harland E. "A History of Religion in Southern California: 1846-1880." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958.

Kenneally, Finbar. "The Catholic Seminaries of California as Educational Institutions." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1956.

Langston, Kathryn Lee. "The Secularization of the California Missions, 1813-1846." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1925.

Whelan, Harold A. "The Picpus Story: 1826-1856." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1972.